DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 185 131 UD 020 113

AUTHOR	Patton, Richard H.; Laue, James H.
TITLE	The Role of Community and School Groups in School Desegregation: Strategies for Crisis and Change.
INSTITUTION	Missouri Univ., St. Louis. Center for Community and Metropolitan Studies.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Oct 79
CONTRACT	400-76-0103
NOTE	177p.; Not available in paper copy due to paper color of original document
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	*Black Students; *Community Involvement; Desegregation Effects; Desegregation Litigation; Desegregation Methods; *Desegregation Plans; Elementary Secondary Education; Equal Education; Minority Groups; *School Desegregation; Student School Relationship; Teacher Integration; *White Students
IDENTIFIERS	*Missouri (Saint Louis)

ABSTRACT

This manual was designed for community and school groups to aid them in clarifying their goals and selecting strategies for resolving issues related to school desegregation. After a brief review of the law, Part 1 reviews the major issues involved in the school desegregation process: quality education, white flight, middle-class minority flight, busing, neighborhood schools, teacher balance, impact of federal education programs on racial balance, school system policies, community involvement, and metropolitan desegregation. The actual process of school desegregation is described as entailing three stages: debate and decision, planning, and implementation; some problems concerning all three are analyzed. The manual also discusses the major actors (school system, parents and students, community, and enforcement agencies) and the major strategies for resolving conflicts in the school desegregation process. Part 2 recommends that the fairest resolution of the desegregation issue is to be attained by participation by all actors in every stage of the process and, to this end, specific strategies are recommended and delineated. Part 3 offers sources of assistance in resolving issues related to school desegregation. A bibliography and appendices are included. (WP)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED185131

The Role of Community and School Groups in School Desegregation: Strategies For Crisis and Change

by

Richard H. Patton
James H. Laue

Center for Metropolitan Studies
University of Missouri-St. Louis

October 1979

Research Supported by

The National Institute of Education,
U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare
Contract 400-76-0103

UD 020113

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Table of Contents

Page

Preface i

Introduction. 1

PART I. UNDERSTANDING SCHOOL DESEGREGATION: The Law, the Community, the Issues, the Stages, the Actors, the Strategies

A. What is School Desegregation? 7

B. A (Very) Short Course in School Desegregation Law. 11

C. School Desegregation as a COMMUNITY Issue. 17

D. The Major ISSUES is the School Desegregation Process 23

E. The Major STAGES in the School Desegregation Process 31

F. The Major ACTORS in the School Desegregation Process 39

G. The Major STRATEGIES for Resolving Conflicts in the School Desegregation Process 53

PART II. DEALING WITH CONFLICT AND CRISIS IN SCHOOL DESEGREGATION: Goals and Strategies for Community and School Groups

A. In Stage 1: Debate and Decision 75

B. In Stage 2: Planning. 103

C. In Stage 3: Implementation. 125

PART III. WHERE TO GET HELP: Sources of Assistance in Resolving Issues Related to School Desegregation

* * *

Appendix A 175

Appendix B 183

Preface

The work leading to production of this manual was carried out over a three year period between July 1976 and June 1979 by staff of the Center for Metropolitan Studies at the University of Missouri-St. Louis. Support for the project was provided by the National Institute of Education under contract 400-76-0103.

The Center for Metropolitan Studies, which was selected for the project because of the previous work of its staff members in community conflict resolution and social policy formulation, conducted intensive field work in two major school desegregation cases in the St. Louis metropolitan area in preparation for publication of the manual. One school desegregation case involved the court-ordered merger of three formerly independent suburban school districts -- Ferguson-Florissant, Berkeley, and Kinloch -- into the Ferguson-Florissant Reorganized School District. The other desegregation case studied was in the City of St. Louis. After more than seven years of legal proceedings, final resolution of the St. Louis case still is pending.

The field work on which this manual is partially based involved both black and white staff members and included site visits, observation of school activities, monitoring of court proceedings, and formal and informal discussion with school system administrators, teachers, students, parents, and parties to the desegregation suits. Training sessions involving parents and school system personnel were conducted in both school districts during the course of the three-year project. In the desegregation case in the City of St. Louis, two comprehensive summary reports with recommendations for resolution of the school desegregation issue were published by the Center.* Prior to publication of these reports, input and review of factual details were sought from the school system, parents and students, the court, parties to the suit and their attorneys, and local business, political, educational, and religious leaders.

Two workshops were held in the winter of 1979 which were specifically directed toward the preparation of this manual. They involved more than 70 parents, teachers, students, administrators, school board members, law enforcement officials, the press, and civic leaders from the Ferguson-Florissant and St. Louis school districts. The focus of these planning sessions was on identifying the major issues and conflicts which are likely to arise during the school desegregation process, and refining methods of conflict resolution and problem-solving which are available. When the first version of this manual was drafted in June of 1979, it was submitted to the 120 persons who had been invited to the workshops for their review. This final version of the manual reflects many of the suggestions which were made for improvement and clarification. Appendix A of this manual lists all the persons who attended the planning workshops, as well as the additional invitees who were unable to attend but received draft copies of the manual for pre-publication review.

In addition to the observation and study that was conducted in the two St. Louis area school desegregation settings, project staff at the Center carried out research on a broader plane. An extensive search and review was made of the literature in the area of school desegregation early in the operation of the project and a comprehensive project library has been maintained to assist with policy analysis and provision of information to groups in the community. Center staff also have maintained a broad network of national contacts with other persons involved with the school desegregation issue.

---

*Resolving the Desegregation Issue in the St. Louis Public Schools, Part I (February 1978, 94 pp.), Part II (February 1979, 84 pp.). Richard H. Patton and James H. Laue (with Daniel Monti and Frances Thomas -- Part I). St. Louis: Center for Metropolitan Studies, UMSL.

While it would be impossible to identify all who have provided assistance either in preparation of this manual or in the general conduct of the project, several persons and groups deserve special acknowledgement for their assistance.

All seven of the parties in the St. Louis school desegregation case -- the Concerned Parents of North St. Louis, the St. Louis Public Schools, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, the Concerned Parents for Neighborhood Schools, the United States Department of Justice, the State of Missouri, and the City of St. Louis -- have been helpful in providing information and reviewing materials developed in conjunction with the project. Similar assistance was provided by the school system and community groups in the Center's more limited involvement in the Ferguson-Florissant Reorganized School District.

In addition to the parties to the St. Louis suit, Center staff also worked closely with other groups which involved themselves in efforts to facilitate the implementation of a system of quality integrated education in St. Louis. Those groups and individuals include:

- The Danforth Foundation and its president Gene Schwilck and vice-president John Ervin, as well as the Interim Citizens Steering Committee established under the auspices of the Foundation.
- The Citizens Education Task Force and its present and past directors, John Wright and Everette Nance, and Assistant Director Virvus Jones.
- The Community Relations Service of the U.S. Department of Justice, particularly field representative Milton Lewis, regional director John Perez, and educational specialist Silke Hansen.

- The St. Louis Chapter of the National Conference of Christians and Jews and the Interfaith/Intergroup Consultation on School Desegregation established under the sponsorship of the NCCJ and its regional director O'Ray Graber.

In addition to these persons and groups who worked directly in the St. Louis area, project staff maintained a network of contacts nationwide so findings and observations in St. Louis could be compared with developments related to school desegregation in other cities. Included among the persons and groups working in the area of school desegregation with whom project staff maintained contacts and to whom project materials were periodically submitted for review were: Rachel Tompkins, Citizens Council of Ohio Schools; Gary Orfield, Institute of Government and Public Affairs, University of Illinois; and Dottie Robyn and David Kirp, Graduate School of Public Policy, University of California at Berkeley.

A special word of thanks is due staff of the Desegregation Studies Unit at NIE who provided consultation and advice on project direction. Foremost is Oscar Uribe, project officer for the last year of the grant, who was especially generous with his time and constructive criticisms. Other NIE staff who assisted this project in important ways were Desegregation Studies Unit director Ronald Henderson, project officers Fritz Edelstein, George Noblit, and Larry Kubota, and administrative officer Mary Ellen Smith.

-- James H. Laue, Principal Investigator
NIE Contract 400-76-0103
and
Director, Center for Metropolitan Studies
University of Missouri-St. Louis

October 1979

* * *

The contract work under which this manual was prepared was under the general oversight of Principal Investigator James H. Laue, Associate Professor of Sociology and Director of the Center for Metropolitan Studies at the University of Missouri-St. Louis. Project Director was Daniel J. Monti, Assistant Professor of Sociology and Fellow in the Center for Metropolitan Studies. Richard H. Patton, Frances L. Thomas, and Gena Scott served as Senior Research Analysts, and Josephine Lockhart and Mark Chesler (of the University of Michigan) were consultants to the project at several important points. Robert Calsyn, Assistant Professor of Psychology and a Center Fellow, assisted with the training workshops. Clerical support for the project was proviced by Senior Secretary Verdell Allen, and Secretaries Sandy Beard, Dianne Zobel, and Elizabeth Lanham. The University provided a group of research assistants and work-study students who also made important contributions to the project: Jacqueline McGee, Donna Busiek, Cathy Donovan, Carol Smart, Mary Moore, Clara Brown, and Mary Dowling.

* * *

Introduction

This manual is intended for use by community and school groups in clarifying their goals and selecting strategies which will contribute to the fair, effective, and lasting resolution of issues related to school desegregation for all the parties with a stake in the situation. It provides a framework for use by local groups in determining their courses of action regarding school desegregation -- not a report of findings primarily of interest to social scientists.

The framework is organized around four areas of focus:

- The major issues which arise during the school desegregation process.
- The major stages in the school desegregation process. Three are designated in this manual.
- The major actors with a stake in the school desegregation process in any community. Five primary types of actors, with many subgroups, have been identified.
- The major strategies for resolution. Eight types of strategies which can be used to achieve fair, effective, and lasting outcomes are examined.

This manual is drafted from a perspective in which school desegregation is viewed as a complex political, social, legal, and educational question with broad implications for the community. A wide range of issues frequently are at stake, and these issues affect the well-being of both the community as a whole and of individual persons and groups. Included among these issues are the constitutional rights of minorities, the quality of education and, perhaps, even the basic stability and prosperity of the community itself. If the school desegregation issue is to be successfully resolved, it is important to maintain peace and harmony -- but is equally important to see that the important questions at stake are addressed intelligently and resolved fairly.

While focusing on the overall good of the community, efforts must be made to address the legitimate needs and concerns of all groups. If minority groups feel that they have been treated in a discriminatory fashion or shortchanged in the allocation of school system resources, a determination must be made as to the validity of those claims -- and if they are found to be valid, an effective plan must be devised to attempt remedy. If, in focusing on the question of a remedy for school desegregation, majority groups develop fears and concerns transcending simple racial prejudice related to pupil transportation, the quality of education, and the settings in which their children will attend school, those issues also must be addressed. There often are, in addition, matters outside of the operations of the school system or the concerns of the parties directly involved that bear on resolution of the issue.

It is the debate over who shall determine validity of conflicting claims and how that should be done that makes school desegregation at heart a political as well as legal and educational issue. Community leaders at all levels must decide to exercise strong leadership and not just "leave it to the courts" or "leave it to the schools." Parent groups and minority groups in particular need to know how the desegregation process works so they may effectively advocate their interests. This manual goes beyond many that deal only with achieving "communication", "peace and harmony" or legal answers alone. School issues are political and community-wide concerns, and must be addressed as such.

The questions involved in school desegregation are difficult and answers are often sought in an environment where beliefs are strong and feelings run high. In such a setting it is not always possible -- or even necessarily desirable -- to avoid conflict. What is necessary and desirable is that ways be sought to use and structure conflict which arises to resolve the questions at issue fairly and to meet the legitimate needs of contending groups, while avoiding harmful disruption of the provision of educational services to children.

Part I of the manual is intended to help the reader develop a basic understanding of the issue of school desegregation. The nature of the desegregation issue is analyzed and a brief summary of the major legal aspects of the question is offered. Attention then is turned to the basic elements of the school desegregation process. Four major components of the process are examined:

- major issues in the school desegregation process
- major stages in the school desegregation process
- the primary actors who are likely to become involved in the desegregation issue
- the main strategies for seeking resolution of the issues available to the actors

Part II of the manual is intended to move forward from the informational base established in Part I and offer some guidelines for dealing with the conflict and crises which often arise during the school desegregation process. The focus of this section is on the identification of the major strategies available to actors in each stage of the desegregation process which can contribute to the fair, effective, and lasting resolution of issues. Strategies available to actors are examined on a state-by-stage basis.

The manual does not attempt to offer a rigid step-by-step formula for how a community should pursue resolution of the desegregation issue.

Differences from community to community, and limitations on the ability of any community to control all aspects of the desegregation question, make such an approach impractical. The approach taken in this handbook is to draw instead on the lessons learned in school districts which have been involved in the desegregation process and offer some general guidelines and specific strategies that might be applied by readers in their own communities.

Part III of the manual provides a listing of two types of resources to which local community and school groups may turn for specific kinds of help regarding any of the elements of the desegregation process -- Agencies and Organizations, and Printed Resource Materials. It is important to emphasize that each local situation is different, and that the parties involved can draw on the experiences of a wide variety of communities in shaping their own strategies. The resource listed in Part III is intended to assist this process.

PART I. UNDERSTANDING SCHOOL DESEGREGATION: THE LAW THE COMMUNITY, THE ISSUES, THE STAGES, THE ACTORS, THE STRATEGIES

A. What is School Desegregation?

For effective involvement in school desegregation activities, it is necessary to start with a clear understanding of what school desegregation is -- a matter that is more complicated that it might seem at first.

School desegregation refers to efforts to improve the racial and/or ethnic mix of students in a system's schools. Desegregation is most likely to become an issue when a significant number of schools in a given school system are racially or ethnically identifiable -- that is, when they do not contain a mix of students that reflects the overall make-up of the school system.

Although a number of mathmatical formulas have been used on occasion to determine if a system's schools are segregated, when school desegregation is approached as a community issue the most important consideration is whether any groups in the community perceive the schools as being segregated. It is that perception of segregated conditions that can lead to political or legal efforts directed at desegregation of the schools.

When viewed in these general terms, school desegregation might be defined as: actions undertaken by a school system, either voluntarily or under order of a court of direction of a agency, to reduce or eliminate racial or ethnic separation in the system's schools.

In discussing the issue of school segregation, a distinction is frequently made between racial isolation that has been caused by law or official action of school officials and segregation that is not the direct result of law or official school system actions. The distinction made is between de jure and de facto segregation.

The term de jure segregation has been used to refer to racial separation in the schools which was caused by law -- such as the laws which existed in southern and border states up to 1954 which required separate schools for black and white children. Also classified as de jure segregation (segregation by law) are the official actions of a board of education which have had the intent of creating or perpetuating racial isolation in a system's schools. In the earliest school desegregation cases, the aim was to eliminate legal and administrative practices causing pupil (and staff) segregation.

The term de facto segregation refers to racial separation that exists in the schools that did not result from law or official actions of a board of education. The school system may view existing racial isolation as accidental or coincidental, and resulting from patterns of residential location for different racial or ethnic groups. Segregation is not caused by school law or the action of the school system. (It should be noted that these patterns of residential location may, in fact, not be accidental, but may be caused by practices in the community outside the schools. If, however, the school system is not implicated in these actions the segregation is regarded as de facto in a school desegregation case.)

Increasingly, however, in recent years the distinction between what was thought to be de jure and de facto segregation has become blurred as court decisions have expanded the definition of school system practices subject to legal action and remedy. Since the Supreme Court's 1973 decision in Keyes v. School Board No. 1 of Denver, school districts have been found guilty of segregative intent if official actions had the "forseeable effect" of fostering segregation.

Another important matter is the distinction between the two primary types of activities that can be undertaken by a school board to eliminate the effects of racial segregation if it is found -- voluntary and court-ordered desegregation.

Voluntary school desegregation. In some instances a school system itself may see that racial segregation exists in its schools and initiate attempts to correct the situation. The system may or may not take responsibility for the existence of that segregation, but in any event it attempts to reduce racial segregation or eliminate its effects using the regular powers with which it operates the school system. Seattle, which began implementation of a voluntary school desegregation plan in December 1978, is a good example.*

Court-ordered school desegregation. The question of segregation in a public school district may also be raised legally by a party outside of the school system. That party often files suit charging that the schools have been operated in a discriminatory fashion with the effect of producing racial isolation. If the school system disputes that allegation, the question will go to court. The school system may either argue that the schools are not segregated, or admit that racial segregation exists but claim that actions of the school system have not been responsible for creating the segregation.

In court, two basic issues are decided: 1) whether segregation exists in the schools and whether the school system is responsible for that segregation (increasingly the courts are finding that one presupposes the other), and 2) the plan which should be imposed to remedy intentional segregation if the school system is found guilty.

Whether school desegregation efforts are voluntary or court-ordered, many of the major political, planning, and educational problems are the same. Court-ordered school desegregation which comes about as the result of litigation addes another dimension to desegregation efforts, however. The next section of this manual is devoted to a brief summary of the basic principles of school desegregation law, and throught the manual distinctions are made between voluntary and court-ordered school desegregation processes where appropriate.

---

*It should be noted that, as in most similar situations, movement toward "voluntary" desegregation in Seattle was spurned by a threatened law suit and an NAAC. complaint filed with the Office of Civil Rights in HEW (Nand Hart-Nibbrig, "School Desegregation Politics: Seattle, Washington," Washington Public Policy Notes 7, 1 /Winter 1979/, University of Washington).

B. A (Very) Short Course in School Desegregation Law.

Many of the school desegregation efforts which are undertaken are carried out under the order of the court. In these instances a suit usually has been initiated charging that a particular school system has been operated in a discriminatory fashion. The court has reviewed these claims, found them to be valid, and ordered that a plan be implemented by the school system to eliminate current discriminatory practices or correct the effects of past discrimnatory practices.

School desegregation law is quite complex. In the nearly three decades since the Supreme Court's 1954 decision in the case of Brown v. the Board of Education, the landmark case that established the foundation for legally imposed desegregation remedies, countless hours of legal deliberation, millions of dollars, and scores of books have been devoted to untangling the legal questions related to school desegregation law. Many of these questions still remain unanswered.

Although the field of school desegregation law is complex, the basic legal foundation on which desegregation cases rests is simple and straightforward. A school desegregation case usually involves litigation to determine if the 14th Amendment of the United States Constitution -- which ensures equal protection of the law -- has been violated. The court examines circumstances in a school system to determine if segregation exists, and if it is de jure segregation caused by law (or actions which have the effect of law) or de facto segregation brought about by circumstances beyond the control of the school system.

The court focuses on two primary issues: 1) the question of school system liability (whether or not the school system is guilty of constitutional violation), and 2) the nature of the desegregation plan to be imposed as a remedy if violation is found. It usually is necessary for the court to find violation (de jure segregation) before it can impose remedy. Parent or other community groups therefore often bring suit to place the burden of proof on the school system -- that is, to place the system in the position of being legally required to show that racial segregation is not a result of official actions with segregative intent.

A brief review of some of the main elements of desegregation law is offered below to aid community groups in understanding the legal background against which so much school desegregation activity takes place.

Legal Terms Used in School Desegregation Cases

Defendant. The party that has been accused of operating the schools in discriminatory fashion -- the school system and board of education. Sometimes the state or state department of education may be named as co-defendant.

Plaintiff. The group or groups that bring the suit charging discriminatory practices. Plaintiffs may include parents groups, civil rights groups (such as the NAACP), or the U.S. Justice Department.

Liability. The question to be decided by the court of whether the school system has been guilty of a constitutional violation by causing racial segregation in the schools.

Remedy. The desegregation plan to be imposed by the court to correct intentional segregation if it has been found in the school system.

De jure Segregation. Racial segregation in a system's schools that has been produced by law or official actions of the school system which had the intent or foreseeable consequences of producing racial isolation. De jure segregation is subject to court-ordered remedy.

De facto Segregation. Racial segregation which exists in a system's schools that is not caused by law or official board actions, but by factors outside and beyond the school system's control. Most frequently the cause of de facto segregation is patterns of residential location related to race. De facto segregation is not subject to legal remedy by the court and may be reduced through voluntary desegregation plans -- or let stand.

The 14th Amendment. The 14th Amendment of the United States Constitution, passed after the Civil War, provides that all citizens of the United States be afforded "equal protection of the laws." The great bulk of school desegregation cases that have been tried since 1954 have been based on this constitutional provision. Desegregation suits have contended that racially motivated laws, or discriminatory school system practices, have deprived minority persons of this equal protection of law.

"Separate But Equal". Although the 14th Amendment was passed shortly after the Civil War, nearly a century passed before it was effectively used to reduce racial separation. In the post-Civil War period there was a desire in many places -- particularly the South -- to avoid integration of the races. Racial integration was effectively avoided by the establishment of separate -- but allegedly equal -- facilities for blacks and whites. This practice became commonly known as "Jim Crow". Legally this separate-but-equal doctrine was upheld in a series of court decisions. The most famous decision was in a Louisiana case in 1896, Plessy v. Ferguson, involving separate railroad facilities. The legal rationale supporting the decision was that racially separate facilities did not violate the 14th Amendment guarantee of "equal protection" if they were of equal quality.

Brown v. the Board of Education. In 1954 the Supreme Court handed down its decision in the case of Brown vs the Board of Education of Topeka, Kansas. That landmark decision revolutionized the direction of school desegregation law. Topeka had provided for the education of black and white children in separate facilities. Black parents dissatisfied with that arrangement challenged that practice in the Brown case. In a now famous decision, the court ruled that "separate educational facilities are inherently unequal." The court examined the effect of racial separation on black children, and ordered that dual school systems (those which educated blacks and whites separately) in 17 southern and border states be dismantled with "all deliberate speed." The "separate but equal doctrine" was overturned.

"Southern" School Desegregation Cases. There was a wide range of responses to the Brown decision in southern and border states with dual school systems. Some states such as Missouri and West Virginia were credited with desegregating their schools immediately. In other places there was massive resistance, often supported by white community leaders.

The first round of legal action following the Brown decision constitutes what are known as "southern" school desegregation cases. In those cases court action was sought to end the operation of racially separate school systems, or to eliminate the segregation which had been produced by such systems. All of these cases dealt with de jure segregation -- segregation by law. Several important cases such as Swann v. Charlotte Mecklenberg, 1971 established the nature and extent of desegregation remedy which could be ordered by a court, including such remedies as busing.

"Northern" School Desegregation Cases. Since schools in "northern" states had not been racially segregated by law, the Supreme Court decision in the Brown case did not appear to affect these systems. While it was clear that racial segregation often was found in northern school systems, it was regarded as de facto segregation, resulting from housing patterns and other practices beyond the control of the school system, rather than de jure segregation resulting from racially motivated educational laws.

In 1973 an important court decision in the Denver case of Keyes v. School Board No. 1 allowed the law developed under the Brown v. Board decision to be applied in a northern school system that had not been segregated by law. It was argued in the case that, although no law had created a racially segregated school system, actions of the Board of Education had resulted in intentional racial separation in the system's schools. The court ruled that the board of education had acted with the intent of segregating students, and that such official board actions effectively constituted segregation by law. The decision opened up all of the nation's school systems where segregation existed for examination -- and potential finding of violation. Keyes ruled that school segregation which was previously thought to be accidental or coincidental (de facto) and not subject to court remedy could, in fact, be intentional and produced by actions which had the effect of law (de jure) and, therefore, be subject to court-ordered plans for remedy.

Metropolitan Desegregation Remedies. As more and more school desegregation cases were tried in the North with courts frequently finding school system violation, a problem developed with efforts to develop remedies for the intentional segregation which was found. In many older, large cities the percentage of blacks, Hispanics, and other minority groups was often very high. In some instances these ethnic and racial minorities made up a heavy majority of the school system. It was difficult to achieve racial balance in schools where such an imbalance existed. Attention was turned to surrounding suburban school systems, and the question which arose was whether suburban school systems could be brought in to plans to attempt to remedy racial segregation.

In an important case in Detroit in 1974, Milliken v. Bradley, the courts ruled that suburban districts could only be involved in area-wide desegregation plans if it could be proved that their establishment or operation was motivated by an intent to segregate. Since it is difficult to prove such intent, and because court-ordered metropolitan desegregation remedies would usually require involving a good mumber of suburban school systems (proving intent to segregate in each one), there has been little court-ordered involvement of suburban school districts in area-wide desegregation plans.

C. School Desegregation as a COMMUNITY Issue

One of the primary messages this manual is intended to convey is that successful resolution of the school desegregation issue depends on the involvement of the entire community. Throughout the country, those cities which report successful experiences with school desegregation have at least one thing in common -- a broad range of community leadership has been involved in settlement of the desegregation issue. In those cities, the issue was viewed as going beyond a mere legal matter for the courts to handle. In commenting recently on the achievement of a smooth transition from segregation to desegregation in places like Detroit, Memphis, and Prince George's County (Md.), the Staff Director of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights said:

> The single most important ingredient in achieving peaceful and successful desegregation is affirmative leadership by those entrusted with that community's social, economic, educational, political and religious institutions.*

All too often the prevailing attitude in communities facing school desegregation is that it is an official matter, to be resolved ultimately by the courts and the school system. Citizen involvement in many instances has come only in response to a court or school system decision that already has been made.

Why should school desegregation be viewed as a community-wide issue? There are a number of reasons:

1. The public schools touch almost everyone in the community in a very personal way — students, parents, grandparents, aunts and uncles, friends. Almost everybody feels he or she has an important stake in the schools.

---

*John Buggs, quoted in Desegregation Without Turmoil (Community Relations Service of the U.S. Department of Justice and National Center for Quality Integrated Education, 1978), p. 3.

2. For those not directly and personally touched by the public schools, the schools nevertheless have a direct bearing on the health of the entire community. Major corporate leaders (many of whom, as in St. Louis, do not live within the city limits and do not have children in the city's public schools) now recognize that the economic vitality of an area is directly tied to the quality of its schools and neighborhoods.

3. Community involvement promotes stability during times of transition such as that produced by school desegregation. People feel -- and actually have -- a sense of ownership in what is going on, rather than feeling they can only react to a decision made by other people whom they cannot influence.

4. Involvement of the community at the earliest stages of desegregation builds a network of communication that may be used if tension and disruption should occur.

5. People are usually more satisfied with the outcome of a situation if they have been involved in the decisions and the planning.

6. Most importantly, people -- especially the parents, students, and others with the highest stakes in the schools -- have a chance to influence decisions that directly affect them.

In short, the experience in American communities so far shows that school desegregation works better when it is treated as a concern of the whole community and not left strictly to the courts or school system. One may look to the work of community-wide coalitions in Dallas, Seattle, Tampa, and Charlotte in addition to Memphis, Detroit, and Prince George's County to see how such community efforts have been successful.

Or one may look to Boston or Louisville to see what may happen when the early phases of school desegregation are handled solely by the courts and the school system. In each case, lack of involvement by local political, business, and religious leaders created a vacuum where violence was allowed to flourish. Also in each case, when a broad range of community leadership became involved later, the process went more smoothly as a variety of groups were able to have their needs represented in a forum other than the streets.

This way of looking at school desegregation has developed from an examination of the situation not only in the St. Louis area, but in cities throughout the country as reported in many of the resource materials listed in Part III of this manual, and as reflected in the work of organizations like the Community Relations Service (U.S. Department of Justice) and the National Conference of Christians and Jews in hundreds of cities. In every instance in which school desegregation proceeded in a manner satisfactory to most of the local parties, there has been broad community involvement. While such involvement is no guarantee of successful resolution, it was clearly absent in the early stages when confrontation and disruption plagued cities like Boston and Louisville.

It is only through this wide involvement of the community, then, that _all_ the important issues relating to school desegregation (not just the legal ones) can be addressed. Resolution of the social, political, and educational questions which are raised by school desegregation is as important to successful settlement of the matter as is resolution of legal questions.

These observations lead to the conclusion that any desegregation process and plan must satisfy the demands of _community acceptability_ as well as _constitutional compliance_ and _educational quality_.

Constitutional compliance. The need for desegregation plans to satisfy constitutional requirement is absolute. Any desegregation plan which is developed must meet legal standards and protect the rights of all of the groups affected. A combination of direct supervision and review by the courts, and the ability of various groups to pursue litigation to protect their positions, usually insures that legal compliance is achieved.

Educational Quality. While there continues to be great debate over what constitutes legal compliance in school desegregation, the disagreement over what is meant by "educational quality" is even greater. Here, as with every other major policy issue affecting the local community, the acceptable definition of quality education must be arrived at by the major parties most involved -- the schools, the parents, the students, and the state board of education (which, in most states, is responsible for assuring high quality public education to all children in the state). Most definitions of high educational quality include (a) high achievement by children across race, class, and geographic lines on some standardized measures of basic academic skills, (b) equal access to education, (c) some component of training for good citizenship, (d) a range of extra-curricular activities, (e) extensive home/school involvement, (f) a high degree of choice for parents and students on educational matters of importance to them, and (g) a good record of placement of secondary school graduates in jobs and further educational opportunities.

Community Acceptability. As indicated above, this standard may be the most important of all in determining whether a school desegregation plan will "work". In the final analysis, the legal system decides on the issue of constitutional compliance. In determining what constitutes educational quality, professional educators and a number of persons and agencies beyond the local community (accrediting bodies and textbook publishers, for example) have a major influence. But only the local community can determine whether a school desegregation plan is politically acceptable. Experience in cities across the nation has shown that in instances in which significant segments of the population regard a desegregation remedy as unfair, impractical, or otherwise undesirable, it was not difficult to disrupt or escape the desegregation effort. Disruption of the plan may entail active opposition in the community and the schools, or a more passive resistance where people exercise one of the many options for removing children from the desegregating school system.

In the light of these three standards, the goal of this manual is to provide a basic blueprint for a community-based process that will allow issues related to school desegregation to be addressed intelligently, fairly, and effectively. Following such a process affords the best opportunity to design a desegregation plan that satisfies the requirements of constitutional compliance, educational quality, and community acceptability.

D. The Major ISSUES in the School Desegregation Process

The major question to be answered in addressing the school desegregation issue is whether a community's schools have been operated in a fashion which has produced racial or ethnic segregation. If such racial or ethnic separation is found, and school desegregation is being pursued legally, attention then focuses on the question of whether it was produced by school system actions that had the intentional and forseeable effect of producing segregated schools. Finally, where segregation exists, a determination will have to be made if efforts will be undertaken to correct it, and an examination made of available methods of remedy.

In route to resolving these major questions, many other related issues will be raised. Those issues may bear directly on the desegregation question, or be only remotely related to it. They may reflect real and legitimate concerns of the actors in the desegregation process, or represent attempts to confuse and cloud the real issues.

Actors in the school desegregation process will be better able to work toward resolution of that matter if they have a basic understanding of these issues and their possible significance and implications. This section of the manual focuses on the identification of the major individual issues which are likely to arise during the school desegregation process, and offers a summary analysis of each. The key to fair, effective, and lasting resolution of matters related to the desegregation of a community's schools is the ability to recognize these issues, put them in proper perspective, and integrate their treatment into an overall strategy for settlement of the desegregation question.

Once the community becomes involved in the school desegregation process, the following issues are likely to be raised:

Quality Education. During the deliberation and debate which takes place over the issue of school desegregation, it is unlikely that any opponents of quality education will emerge. Frequently, however, persons and groups on opposing sides of the desegregation question have different perspectives on the issue of quality education. Opponents of systematic attempts to desegregate the community's schools often express the belief that the primary concern of the school system should be the provision of quality education. It is frequently their claim that systematic attempts at school desegregation do little or nothing to improve the quality of education in the school system -- and may actually impair it. In this view, instead of focusing on the issue of racial balance, the school system should direct its programmatic efforts to improving the quality of education system-wide.

Supporters of school desegregation efforts invariably support the notion of quality education too, but they may view it as an issue legally separate from the question of school desegregation. In addition, there is a frequent suspicion among desegregation supporters that the intense concern about the issue of quality education which so often emerges during the desegregation process is a diversionary tactic. Their concern is that quality education is highly stressed as the issue of primary importance in an attempt to avoid school desegregation.

From a legal standpoint the issues of quality education and racial integration are essentially separate matters. Constitutional concern is with the matter of equal access to the school system, and not with the quality of education offered per se. From an educational perspective both concerns are important. Equal access to a poor educational system does little to benefit anyone. What is needed is equal access to a system which offers high quality education.

White Flight. It is frequently alleged that systematic attempts to desegregate a community's schools lead to the flight or movement of white population from the school system. Since in many school systems -- particularly in older central cities -- the percentage of white students is relatively small, the argument is made that systematic desegregation efforts may actually reduce racial integration by producing such flight. Social scientists are divided on whether or not such flight takes place, and the extent of flight, if any, which occurs.* Proponents of school desegregation often argue that the "white flight" issue does not bear on resolution of the legal question of equal protection of the law.

Middle-class Minority Flight. Another issue involving the movement of population from the school system relates to out-migration of middle-class minority families. In many older central cities it has been found that middle-class minorities are moving out at a rate equal to, or faster than, middle-class whites. One explanation that has been offered for this occurrence is the inability of middle-class minorities to find good schooling because of racial and ethnic discrimination. From this perspective, failure to desegregate central city schools may mean that they become increasingly lower-class.

Busing. The practice of transporting students to schools outside their "neighborhood" is, perhaps, the most volatile single issue related to school desegregation. Opponents of such transportation cite distance, safety, time, access to sick or injured students -- and, recently, the energy crisis -- as considerations which should eliminate the busing of students. Busing proponents say that busing is a common practice in American education and often the only way to achieve racial integration in a school system. They view the opposition to the transportation of students as being

---

*For a debate by social scientists on this issue, see "School Desegregation in Large Cities: A Critique of the Coleman White Flight Thesis," Thomas Pettigrew and Robert Green, Harvard Educational Review, 46 (February 1976) p. 1-53.

based in the integration it would produce, rather than in the process of transportation itself.

Neighborhood Schools. Closely related to the busing issue is the issue of neighborhood schools. Defenders of the neighborhood school concept say the neighborhood school is an institution which is vital to the American system of local, public education. The school is, they say, a crucial part of the local community, and abandonment of neighborhood schools would weaken both the schools and neighborhoods. Supporters of systematic desegregation efforts frequently argue that staunch defense of the neighborhood school is just a guise for opposition to school integration. Adherence to the concept of neighborhood schools in school systems where residential segregation is widespread would, they say, insure continued educational segregation.

Teacher and Staff Balance. In addition to the attention which the racial composition of the student body at individual school sites receives when school desegregation emerges as an issue, racial balance among teachers and staff is also likely to come under examination. If efforts are made to improve racial balance among teachers and staff through the use of transfers, opposition may be encountered. In addition to any racial feelings and bias which might be involved, such transfers may be opposed by teachers and staff, or school employee organizations and associations, on the grounds that they violate employment rights related to tenure and placement.

School System Policies and Practices. Any determination of whether a school system has operated in a discriminatory fashion is based largely on an examination of the school system's policies and practices related to racial and ethnic balance. Areas of school system operation which are likely to receive attention when issues related to racial balance are raised include: placement and transfer policies, building and construction practices, curriculum, staff balance, and the drawing and alteration of attendance zones. Because local school systems frequently operate under the jurisdiction of a state board or department of education, the state's role in the establishment of local policies and practices may also be examined. Interest in determining state responsibility for local school system operations is often related to a desire to secure state funds to pursue a remedy if school system violation is found.

Impact of Federal Education Programs on Racial Balance. In addition to examining the effect that local and state educational policies and practices have had on racial balance in the schools, federal educational programs may also come under examination. Federal programs such as those operated under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (Title I) and the Emergency School Aid Act frequently have either a direct or indirect effect on racial balance in the schools. Claims are sometimes registered that federal educational programs have contributed to racial imbalance and that programs should be halted or federal funds made available to finance corrective desegregation efforts.

Social Class as a Factor in School Desegregation. There is considerable evidence that both "minority" and "majority" middle class families seek residential and educational environments where other middle class persons predominate.* If that is in fact the case, it would appear to have considerable significance for school desegregation efforts which are attempted in certain settings. The population composition of some school districts -- particularly those in older central cities -- may require changing the social class composition of a large number of schools in order to improve racial balance. Those changes often would require a reduction of the number of schools where middle class students constitute a majority. Aside from any racial or ethnic prejudice which may be involved, middle class parents appear to object to the placement of their children in educational environments that do not in large part reflect their educational and social values. Arguments for racially or ethnically separate schools cannot be supported, and, in fact, no longer are frequently forwarded. It is far more difficult to argue that minority and majority middle-class parents cannot insist that their children be educated in schools which reflect their educational values. When efforts to achieve racial and ethnic balance come into conflict with the desire of middle-class parents to see their children in middle-class school settings, a serious dilemma is created.

---

*The Declining Significance of Race: Blacks and Changing American Institutions, William J. Wilson, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1978.

School System Governance and Community Involvement in Educational Decision-Making. Another issue which often arises during the school desegregation process relates to the governance of the school system. Common complaints are that school board members and the system administrators are not responsive to the needs and wishes of the community, and that parents have little or no power in major educational decisions. Because of this intense focus on the issue of educational decision-making, increased parental involvement in school system policy formulation may emerge as a by-product of the desegregation process. Committees and commissions which are established to deal directly with issues concerning school desegregation frequently have strong representation from parents and community groups.

The Nature of the Plan for Remedy. If a determination is made that a system's schools are indeed segregated and that a plan should be devised to remedy that situation, a decision will have to be reached regarding the nature of the desegregation plan. A wide variety of techniques are available for use in efforts to achieve school desegregation. Included among them are redistricting, pairing, clustering, magnet schools, etc. In many districts some combination of these techniques is used.

Closely related to the type of desegregation plan to be implemented is the matter of which persons or groups are selected to participate in plan development. The decision regarding who will devise the plan determines in large part what the plan will be. As noted earlier, any desegregation plan which hopes to be successful must satisfy three basic requirements. The plan must: 1) meet legal requirements, 2) have a basic degree of acceptance in the community, and 3) provide for high quality education.

Metropolitan Desegregation. When desegregation efforts are focused in the central cities of older metropolitan areas, serious demographic problems -- problems related to the make-up of the population -- may arise. Frequently, older central cities (particularly those of the northeast and midwest) are comprised of a high percentage of minority population. Because that minority population is usually younger than the majority population -- with more children of school age and more people in their child-bearing years -- the percentage of "minority" population in the schools is often higher still. In some instances "minority" students may in fact constitute a predominant majority of the school age population. The question which arises is how the central city schools can be desegregated with such strong racial imbalance and so few majority students. From a strictly demographic standpoint, the answer to that question is obvious. It is the suburbs which hold the demographic complement necessary to help central city schools achieve some degree of social class and racial balance.

The issue of metropolitan desegregation remedies raises a variety of educational, legal, and political questions. While these matters are often difficult and complex, their resolution may be critical to achieving successful and lasting desegregation.

* * *

It is these specific issues, as well as the larger question of constitutional liability, that must be addressed in resolving the school desegregation question. The balance of this manual is directed toward construction of a framework for dealing with these issues and the provision of guidelines for strategies that will be helpful in successfully resolving the questions related to desegregation of a community's schools.

E. Major STAGES in the School Desegregation Process

Resolving the school desegregation issue is a job which is lengthy and complex. Once questions related to the desegregation of a community's schools have been raised, it may be years before any type of settlement is reached. School desegregation efforts in places such as Los Angeles, St. Louis, Columbus, and Dayton offer ample evidence of the length and complexity of the desegregation process*

The sheer length and complexity of the process of seeking resolution can make it difficult for persons in the community to come to grips with the desegregation question. At any given time, it may be hard to determine what exact issues are at stake and what tasks need to be performed. In addition, it is necessary to have some sense of how actions which are taken may affect events three, five, or even 10 years down the road.

The intent of this manual is to provide assistance to persons who are involved in the issue of school desegregation so they can focus their efforts and activities to have maximum effect in achieving fair, effective, and lasting resolution of the desegregation question. To a large extent that task is accomplished by finding strategies which are appropriate to address the problems and issues which arise. The actors in the desegregation process must themselves make these choices; a clear understanding of the process of school desegregation can help.

The school desegregation process consists of three major phases:

- The Debate and Decision stage
- The Planning stage

---

*In Los Angeles, the case was in the courts for 16 years before the legal issues were resolved. In St. Louis, the case filed in 1972 was just entering the appeals process late in 1979. The issues in Dayton and Columbus had been in the courts for more than six years, and finally were settled by the U.S. Supreme Court in June 1979.

- The Implementation stage

In each stage a related set of questions must be resolved, and the way those questions are resolved affects what will happen in the next stage.

Stage 1 - Debate and Decision

When school desegregation is raised as a community issue, it is necessary to examine the various sides of the question and come to a decision on two primary matters. Those matters are:

1. Whether the community's public schools are segregated.
2. If segregation is found to exist, whether systematic efforts should be made to correct it.

If these questions regarding school segregation are raised in the courts through filing of a suit -- as has frequently been the case -- it also is necessary to determine whether any segregation that is found is due to deliberate action of the school system, or to action which had the forseeable effect of segregating the schools. Should the court find the school system guilty of segregative actions, it is obligated to consider available methods of remedy.

When school desegregation is not pursued legally and left to the authority of the school system, there is more flexibility in the options involved. A school system may pursue elimination of school segregation even if deliberate intent is not involved, or it may find willful segregation exists, but decide not to undertake attempts to correct it.

Whether the issue gets into the courts usually is determined by parents, private groups such as the NAACP, or agencies like the Civil Rights Division of the U.S. Department of Justice — all of whom may bring suit against a school board regarding alleged racial segregation. Such groups usually make their decision on whether to bring legal action based on their feelings about the extent of racial isolation in the system, the willingness of school officials to change, the attitude of the larger community, and the availability of paths of action which do not involve the courts.

There are two basic tasks to be performed in this initial stage of the desegregation process if major issues are to be resolved fairly and effectively.

1. Data and information which will provide a complete picture of the racial situation in the system's schools must be collected and analyzed. Issues to be examined include the racial composition of the system's schools, administrative procedures, and school system policies and practices related to the issue of racial balance.

2. An opportunity must be afforded to all of the groups in the community who will be involved in, or affected by, resolution of the desegregation question to participate in the desegregation process. That involvement includes the opportunity to develop an understanding of the issue, as well as ability to have input into the process and register their concerns.

Accomplishment of these tasks is essential to successful resolution of the major issues in Stage 1 of the desegregation process. It is only after the most complete data and information available have been collected, and all actors have been allowed to develop an understanding of the issues and register their opinions and concerns, that an adequate foundation is provided on which to reach an intelligent and fair decision on whether segregation which can be remedied exists in the school system -- whether that decision is a result of litigation (as usually is the case) or school system actions on a voluntary basis.

Stage 2 - Development of a Desegregation Plan

If a decision is reached that segregation exists in the school system and efforts should be undertaken to remedy that segregation, it is necessary to proceed to development of a detailed desegregation plan. The plan will spell out the remedy or specific actions that will be undertaken in efforts to correct segregation and integrate the system's schools.

In virtually every city in which the issue has gone to court, there has been a finding of at least some segregation requiring corrective action in the school district. The history and pervasiveness of racial discrimination in American society has made this so. In a limited number of situations, the debate has taken place outside the courts (as in Seattle and Milwaukee), and the decision to proceed with some action to overcome racial isolation in the schools is made by school officials and/or broader community leadership. In those few instances where litigation has not resulted in a finding requiring some remedy, the raising of the desegregation issue usually heightens interest and involvement in the schools.

It is important to remind readers at this point that this manual is intended primarily for use by community groups who are involved in or anticipate going through the desegregation process -- from Debate and Decision to Planning and Implementation. The principles and strategies presented may also be useful to persons and groups in those few racially diverse communities found to be free of racial segregation in the schools.

When a decision to desegregate has been made, in this second stage the focus no longer is on the question of liability -- whether segregation exists and the responsibility for that segregation -- but on the nature and extent of remedy.

The primary issues to be considered in Stage 2 are:

1. The extent to which racial balance in the schools can be improved in view of the racial composition of the school population and its distribution in the school system.

2. How the quality of education offered by the school system can be maintained or enhanced during school desegregation.

3. The cost of desegregation efforts and how they will be financed.

4. Specific techniques which can be employed in light of these other considerations to achieve effective and lasting school integration.

The manner in which many of these questions will be resolved depends to a large extent on who participates in formulation of the desegregation plan. That is a major issue which must be resolved at the very outset of this stage, and the strategies proposed in Part II of this manual call for the widest possible involvement of community stakeholders in planning.

Three characteristics will determine the success of any plan which is developed. These characteristics are derived from the three standards noted in section C of this manual. All efforts in Stage 2 of the desegregation process should be directed to development of a plan which:

- Complies with all legal requirements.
- Provides quality education to all students in the school system.
- Has at least the basic support and acceptance of a substantial majority of persons -- and especially organizational leaders -- in the community.

With a school desegregation plan in hand which meets these requirements, the community is on firm footing to proceed to the third stage of the desegregation process.

Stage 3 - Implementation of the Desegregation Plan

The task of school desegregation does not end with the development of a good plan. Once a sound plan is in hand it must be put into operation. It is in this third stage that a determination is made whether school desegregation remains an unfulfilled prescription or becomes a reality.

Even a good plan will face some difficulties. Some degree of community resistance will undoubtedly be encountered and a wide range of operational problems related to plan implementation will have to be worked out. Efforts will also have to be made to insure that re-segregation does not take place in the school system.

Working out the mechanical details related to the implementation of the desegregation plan is a task which falls largely to the school system. With adequate funding and the availability of the necessary administrative skills, changes related to such issues as student placement, teacher assignment, and transportation can be carried out with reasonable speed and efficiency.

The involvement of groups outside the school system in implementing desegregation focuses in two primary areas. The first is in winning community support and acceptance for the plan and insuring that all citizens conduct themselves in an orderly and lawful fashion during plan implementation. The second task which requires the involvement of community groups is the establishment of specific mechanisms to monitor the plan's implementation and deal with any problems which may arise. Included among these functions are the operation of a monitoring commission and establishment of grievance mechanisms.

In short, school desegregation may be viewed as a process involving three general stages corresponding to the three major questions that need to be addressed regarding segregation and its prospective remedies: whether school segregation exists and efforts should be undertaken to remedy it (Debate and Decision stage), what plan should be carried out to achieve remedy (Planning stage), and how should that plan be implemented (Implementation stage). Part II of this manual examines each of these three stages in detail, focusing on strategies available to the various actors in the process which contribute to fair, effective, and lasting resolution of the desegregation issue.

F. The major ACTORS in the School Desegregation Process

As school desegregation proceeds through its various stages, a wide range of community organizations, interest groups, agencies, and individuals -- in the local community and beyond -- are likely to become involved. It is these persons and groups that become the major actors in the school desegregation process and determine its outcome.

In examining these actors and the role each plays during school desegregation, it is possible to divide them into five major categories. This division provides a framework for understanding the way they behave and relate to one another when school desegregation arises as an issue.

The five major categories of actors, and the major groups which make up each category, are as follows:

1. The School System (providers of educational services).

- Board of education
- System-wide school administration and staff
- Principals
- Teachers
- Support staff

2. Parents and Students (users of educational services).

- Parents and parents groups
- Students and student groups
- Users of adult educational services

3. Community Leadership (groups which determine the community environment in which school desegregation efforts take place).

- Business leaders
- Political leaders
- Religious leaders
- Neighborhood leaders
- Educational leaders
- Civil rights leaders
- Other civic and community groups

4. Enforcement Agencies (organizations with legal or administrative authority to order or enforce actions on the school system related to desegregation).

- Federal and state courts
- State educational agencies
- Federal educational and civil rights agencies
- Police and other law enforcement agencies

5. Other Interest Groups.

- Pro-desegregation groups
- Anti-desegregation groups
- Technical assistance groups (universities, research centers, foundations, public agencies without enforcement power)
- Media

* * * *

It is not possible to predict exactly how each of these actors will behave in every instance. There are, however, many similarities between these groups from community to community.

The activities which groups and organizations undertake, and the strategies which they employ, are determined by a number of factors related to goals, power base, technical expertise, and financial resources. These factors are important in determining what the group does, and the success of its efforts.

In this section of the manual, a brief examination of the major actors in the school desegregation process is offered, based on these factors. It may be helpful to the reader to have a short check-list of questions to be asked in evaluating the power and potential actions of these types groups. These questions are presented in this section as part of the framework, and are applied in greater detail in Part II of the manual, "Dealing with Conflict and Crisis in School Desegregation."

Checklist for Assessing Groups Involved in School Desegregation

- What are the group's primary goals -- what do they want the outcome of the situation to be?
- How do that group's goals or interests line up with your own?
- What is the source of the group's power or influence -- do they have legal power, political clout, or large amounts of money?
- Does the group have the information and technical skills necessary to deal effectively with the issue?
- Is the group cohesive -- do all persons who are affiliated with the group agree basically on what needs to be done and how to do it?
- Is the group strong organizationally? Does it have a large membership base, strong institutional supports, organizational skills, and the funds to operate effectively over the long haul?
- Does the group have any exceptional strengths -- such as political skill, numerous allies, or unusually dedicated members?
- Does the group have any important weaknesses -- such as small membership or weak base, little money, or lack of access to needed information?

Now each of the types of actors is described briefly. A detailed analysis of their roles at the various stages of the desegregation process is contained in Part II, where strategies for each actor are discussed stage-by-stage.

1. The School System
(Providers of Educational Services)

The school system is, in many ways, the single most powerful actor in the school desegregation process. Legal responsibility for the operation of the schools rests with the system. Before school desegregation emerges as an issue, during the time the issue is being resolved, and after desegregation of the schools passes as an active community concern, the day-to-day delivery of educational services will be controlled primarily by the school system. The system controls large numbers of employees, many fiscal resources, considerable technical expertise, and a large store of information. All of those resources can be used to influence the way in which the desegregation issue is resolved. The school system's legal power and numerous resources can be used to resist or aid the process of school desegregation.

The school system is a powerful actor in the desegregation process; it is also a complex organization. It is made up of many actors and groups -- and the actions of all of these internal groups are not always easily coordinated or controlled. Whatever decision is made regarding school desegregation at the top levels of the school system, it is likely there will be some internal, as well as external, complications and resistance.

The major actors within the school system are:

a) The Board of Education. As the school system's highest decision-making body, the board possesses the wide range of powers related to school operations discussed above. When the issue of school system responsibility for segregation is raised, it is the policies and practices of the board and top level administrators which come under scrutiny. Because board members generally are chosen by an election process in the district, the board is first and always a political body.

If voluntary desegregation is pursued, the board is the body that is responsible for that decision. If, on the other hand, desegregation is pursued through litigation, the board and the school system usually become the primary target of the legal action.

A wide range of factors is likely to come into play in shaping the board's response to the desegregation issue. Most of those factors seem to weigh in favor of the board maintaining the status quo, rather than voluntarily undertaking changes to improve racial balance. Included among the factors that serve to make school boards resistant to pursuing broad changes to achieve desegregation of the system's schools are:

- Board members may see the improvement of racial and ethnic imbalance as difficult or impossible in light of the make-up and distribution of the system's population.
- School systems, which are frequently beset with problems and short of funds, may lack enthusiasm for taking on a new problem that is complex and costly.
- Board members may fear that an admission of school system responsibility for discriminatory practices would reflect badly on the school system, the board, and, perhaps, some individual board members. Board members may also resent the fact that actions taken in the past -- in a setting characterized by different social and educational values -- are now being re-examined and judged by new standards.
- Board members (in school systems as well as other organizations) wish to maintain control of the organization for which they are accountable, and often resist outside challenges to such control.

Whatever the stance of the school board, and whatever its concerns and motivations, it probably exercises more actual control over the desegregation process than any other actor. All efforts to achieve resolution of the desegregation questions should include the board. Ultimately it is the school system which controls the tools necessary to establish the highest possible degree of quality integrated education.

b) System-wide Administrators. Top school system administrators have the primary responsibility for carrying out the policy decisions of the board of education. It is their job to translate board policy into school system operations. As professional educators, top administrators may feel inclined to undertake desegregation programs which are more far-reaching than those envisioned by the board, but they may be restricted by political constraints imposed by the board. System-wide administrators, in addition, often encounter resistance to proposed changes from building-level personnel -- principals, teachers, and staff -- and parents and students who may not like the personal changes required of them in implementing new programs.

c) Principals, Teachers, and Staff. These persons, who are responsible for the operations of the schools at the individual building sites, are the personnel within the system who will ultimately find themselves most affected by implementation of a desegregation plan. Because such changes are likely to affect them most profoundly, they are the group within the system which may be most resistant to desegregation plans.

These same actors -- principals, teachers, and staff -- also are the group which will be most directly involved in actually implementing any desegregation plan. To a large extent they will determine if school desegregation efforts are to be successful. If a decision is made to proceed with desegregation efforts, immediate attention must be focused on preparing and equipping building level personnel to effectively achieve integration of the system's schools.

2. Parents and Students
(Users of Educational Services)

The school system is the actor in the desegregation process which is most likely to play the major role in determining the outcome of desegregation efforts. It is, however, the consumers of public educational services -- the students and their parents -- who are most likely to initially raise the desegregation issue. Once the issue has been raised, it is also these groups who are most likely to apply pressure on the school system to bring the matter to resolution.

Initial pressure for school desegregation is likely to come from users of the educational services who are dissatisfied with the educational "product" they are being offered. Most frequently this is a group of minority parents who feel that their children are not receiving the best education available within the school system because of racial discrimination. In raising this issue and seeking resolution, these groups often are joined by other groups who act as advocates or representatives of similar interests. The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and the United States Department of Justice are the groups which most frequently join parents in pushing for desegregation efforts (see Enforcement Agencies and other Interest Groups below). Once the question of school desegregation is raised, it is extremely likely that parents' groups on the other side of the issue will become involved.

a) Parents and Parent Groups. The primary power of the consumers of educational services -- students and their parents -- to affect the outcome of the desegregation question lies in two areas. One area is political organization, the other is legal action. Parents and parent groups who become involved in the school desegregation question, regardless of whether they support or oppose systematic efforts to desegregate the schools, will find that their success depends on an ability to operate effectively in one or both of these areas.

Parents and parent groups that become involved in the school desegregation issue almost invariably find themselves operating with a series of handicaps the courts, school systems, established civic leaders, and technical assistants do not have to face. Parents involved in school desegregation seldom have the fiscal resources, technical expertise, or ease of access to information that is readily available to these other actors. Their effective participation in the desegregation process will require an additional expenditure of time and energy to acquire these skills and develop their resources.

Another factor which affects the way in which parents and parent groups conduct themselves during the desegregation process is the way they view parents on the other side of the issue. If opposing parents groups are viewed as competitors for an outcome in which only one side will win, one set of strategies is dictated. In this view, parent groups on opposite sides of the question may be viewed as enemies.

An alternate perception of parents on opposing sides of the desegregation question is that they are pursuing a similar goal -- the best possible education for their children. The issue then becomes one of whether or not the school system can establish a system of educational service delivery that meets the needs of all children. With this orientation, parents in the system ultimately can become allies working to obtain quality education for all of the children which the school system serves.

b) Students and Student Groups. Although it is the needs of students which are at the center of the school desegregation issue, students frequently become only pawns in the process. Students may be left in inadequate school settings through a lengthy desegregation process or moved about unproductively in pursuit of an acceptable remedy.

As major actors in the desegregation process -- and certainly the group which is most profoundly affected by desegregation efforts -- students should be represented in all deliberations related to the issue. In the implementation of school desegregation plans, students should receive preparation and training to help them deal with the new situations they will face. Additionally, well-understood and effective grievance mechanisms should be set up to provide a method of dealing with student-related problems.

3. Community Leadership

(Group which Determine the Community Environment in
(Which Activities Related to School Desegregation Will Take Place)

Pursuit of resolution of the school desegregation issue does not take place in a vacuum. Settlement is sought in the context of a broader community environment, which determines to a large extent the manner in which the school desegregation question will be approached and the types of behavior that will be exhibited by the individuals and groups involved.

The nature of the community environment in which the school desegregation process is carried out is not accidental. It is largely established by the community's leadership. Those groups determine to a great extent whether resolution of the school desegregation issue will be sought in a constructive and orderly manner, or in an environment which is emotional and devisive. They represent the ongoing organizational character of the community which remains long after specific issues and crises are resolved.

Each of the groups noted -- business, political, religious, neighborhood, educational, civil rights, and other civic organizations -- can contribute to the creation of a good or a bad atmosphere in which community problem-solving may take place. Their leaders and members can become advocates for a fair and open process, or a closed process that inevitably feeds suspicion and hostility. The roles of each of these types of groups and leaders are detailed in Part II of this manual, including the prospects for formation of community-wide coalitions of citizen leaders.

4) Enforcement Agencies
(Organizations with Legal or Administrative Authority to Order or Enforce Actions on the School System)

Many agencies external to the local school system have responsibility for the delivery of educational services or assuring that laws are being enforced fairly and equally. Included in this group are the courts, federal agencies, state departments of education, and police and other law enforcement agencies. When school desegregation arises as an issue, these groups can use their legal, administrative, or enforcement powers as a base from which to influence resolution of the issue.

As established agencies with professional staff, these actors usually have a solid organizational base from which to operate and good access to needed expertise and information. They may, however, be less than fully familiar with the educational aspects of the issue, or the peculiarities of a local case. A brief examination of the roles of these groups follows.

a) Federal and State Courts. When resolution of the school desegregation issue is pursued legally, it is taken to the courts for settlement. The court is faced with two basic questions: 1) has constitutional violation of the rights of any group taken place due to the manner in which the schools have operated? and 2) what remedy should be imposed by the court if violation has occurred? While courts have the expertise necessary to resolve the legal questions at issue, they often are not equipped to deal with important social, political, and educational matters that affect the community. Particularly in devising desegregation remedies, it is essential that the court look outside itself for information and assistance.

b) State Educational Agencies. Frequently state departments of education have ultimate legal authority for the education of children in the state. Those departments often have a broad range of powers related to the operation of local school systems. If they so choose, state educational agencies may use those powers to require local school systems to take action related to school desegregation. It is more likely, however, that state educational agencies will take a "hands off" approach to racial issues in local schools. Despite that usual approach, it is important to note that use of state action could be an important strategy in resolution of issues related to school desegregation.

c) Federal Educational and Civil Rights Agencies. There are a number of federal agencies empowered to enforce policy related to educational and civil rights issues, the most prominent of which are the Civil Rights Division of the U.S. Department of Justice and the Office of Civil Rights of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Even those Federal agencies that are not armed with the direct power to enforce law can use their control of funds to obtain compliance from local school systems. When matters related to racial balance in a system's schools are raised as issues, these agencies can sometimes use their powers to achieve resolution. It is important, however, that efforts are made to insure that agency action is responsive to real problems and issues. Random generation and enforcement of bureaucratic regulations may do nothing to solve complex problems and may serve to aggravate them.

d) Police and Other Law Enforcement Agencies. In instances of court-ordered school desegregation, the police may become an enforcement arm of the court. Although police do not have the power to make policy decisions related to school desegregation, they often become instrumental in the resolution of such matters because of their involvement in enforcement. Access to schools, student safety, transportation, and maintenance of community stability are issues in which the police and other law enforcement officials may become involved.

5. Other Interest Groups

There often are groups not directly involved in the provision or use of local educational services -- or the legal or administrative regulation of those services -- which have an interest in the way the school desegregation issue is resolved. Frequently these groups become actors in the school desegregation process and attempt to influence its resolution. Included among these interest groups are:

a) Pro-Desegregation Groups. Local and national organizations such as the NAACP, the Urban League, and a number of churches and denominational offices fall in to this category. Their activities may range from informal consultation to participation in litigation.

b) Anti-Desegregation Groups. Examples include a number of moderate groups on both local and national levels, and such extremist groups as the Ku Klux Klan.

Both of these types of groups may be well-established and well-funded, or they may be relatively new and organizationally inexperienced, as are many of the anti-desegregation organizations which spring up when a community is facing school desegregation. Frequently the groups have concerns that go beyond the issue of educational service delivery. Their involvement may be based in an ideology or political philosophy. Such organizations may operate independently or through the provision of financial and technical support to local groups.

c) Technical Assistance Groups. There are a number of groups in the community which are not involved in the school desegregation issue in any of the ways listed above, but which still have interests, expertise, or resources related to the desegregation question. Among them are universities, research centers, and various public and private social service agencies.

Universities and their various departments and research centers often are good sources of the skills and expertise which are important to the desegregation process. These institutions can play an important role in collecting needed data, organizing information, providing training, and consulting with parties to resolve technical issues. It is important that the involvement of academic institutions be structured so that it facilitates the desegregation process, rather than simply serving the needs of the university and its researchers. Foundations interested in education or urban problems may also play a technical assistance role.

There are a number of local, state, and federal governmental agencies which have no direct enforcement powers related to the desegregation question, but which are in a position to provide assistance to the community and individual parties. As with universities, this assistance can include provision of information, training, or contribution of expertise. The same cautions must be applied to assure that involvement is not self-serving, and that assistance is provided in an impartial and unbiased fashion.

d) Media. Local media -- newspapers, radio, and television -- play an important role in determining public perception of, and reaction to, the desegregation issue. It has already been noted that it is important for persons in the community and actors in the desegregation process to have access to comprehensive and accurate information related to desegregation of the community's schools. Local news media can play an important role in providing such information. Full and balanced news reporting is an essential component of successful community efforts to deal with school desegregation. The scope and tone of news coverage can determine what people know about the issue and how they react to it. It is particularly important that sensationalism and headline-grabbing be recognized as disruptive exercises which must be avoided.

* * *

With the major issues, stages, and actors in the school desegregation process identified, the next section of the manual turns to a review of the strategies for resolution that are available to the various actors.

G. Major STRATEGIES for Resolving Conflicts in the School Desegregation Process

The successful resolution of many of the problems and issues which arise during the process of school desegregation is dependent on the ability of the various actors in the community to select strategies and techniques that address those matters fairly and effectively. Because the desegregation process is complex, the task of selecting appropriate strategies and techniques often is difficult. In Part II of this manual, an attempt is made to establish some guidelines for resolution of the desegregation issue. The focus in that section is on the use of specific strategies by different actors in the various stages of the desegregation process to effectively address issues that must be resolved.

Before going on to that complex question, the major strategies and techniques available for pursuing resolution will be briefly reviewed here. That should help to clarify the final section of the manual by allowing the reader to focus there on how and when the various strategies should be used, rather than what they are.

The strategies and techniques that are available to influence the outcome of the school desegregation question are similar to those which can be used to affect any public policy issue. Those strategies and techniques fall into eight basic categories:

- Information techniques
- Communication techniques
- Political organization
- Administrative sanctions
- Legal intervention
- School System action
- Training
- Mechanisms for conflict resolution

This section of the manual offers a brief summary of each of these strategies or techniques, in the same fashion that the preceding section offered a brief overview of the major actors in the school desegregation process. In selecting a particular strategy or technique for use during any of the three stages of the school desegregation process, actors may want to ask themselves the series of questions which appears below.

Checklist for Assessing Strategies in School Desegregation

- Does the strategy or technique address the issue at hand directly?
- Will use of the strategy or technique avoid "overkill" or unnecessary escalation of the issue? Does it leave an opening for use of other options further down the line?
- Is the strategy or technique fair? Does it avoid distortion of information, sensationalism, and playing on the emotions, fears, or prejudices of persons in the community?
- If the desegregation issue is in litigation, will the strategy fall within the established legal framework? Is there any danger of being found in contempt of court for employing the strategy?
- Do you or your group possess the skills and resources necessary to follow through on use of the strategy or technique?
- What response is use of the strategy or technique likely to bring from other actors in the process? Are you prepared and able to deal with that response?
- If the strategy or technique succeeds, what will the likely effects be?
- Should use of the strategy or technique fail, how will that affect your group's position?

The major techniques and strategies for resolution now are examined in greater detail.

1. Information Techniques.

When people reach a decision on an issue, or lay out a course of action, they do so on the basis of the information they have about the situation. To a great extent what people know about a matter influences how they react to it, and what they choose to do about it.

One range of strategies that is available to influence the outcome of the school desegregation issue relates to the use of information. If people have a lot of good information on a subject, they are more likely to reach a fair and effective resolution of issues. On the other hand, judgments and decisions based on partial or misinformation are less likely to contribute to fair and lasting settlement of important questions. The parties need information which provides objective data, clarifies issues, and identifies possible solutions to problems.

Actors in the school desegregation process should focus their concern about information in two areas:

- Each actor should have enough information to develop a good understanding of the overall process of school desegregation, as well as a basic grasp of the many individual issues involved.
- Each set of actors should generate and organize the information that is needed to formulate and support its position and portray it clearly to the other actors in the process.

Aside from the needs of the individual actors, it also is important to build a sound common base of factual information. Such a foundation gives the many actors in the process a starting point from which to begin to work toward resolution of issues. Having accurate and reliable information on hand also is important in eliminating the negative effects of rumors and misinformation.

When resolution of the school desegregation question is pursued through the courts, the court record serves to some extent to provide such information. Court data are not, however, usually prepared for use by the public and are not always easily accessible. Individual actors in the desegregation process generally are not the best sources of summary information. Even if their information is accurate, the group's credibility may be called into question by opposing parties.

The need is for information which is accurate, comprehensive, recognized as reliable, and easily accessible. The best source of such information often is a group in the community with informational resources and research skills that is not directly involved in the desegregation process as a competitor for a particular outcome. A university, government agency, foundation, or civic organization can often play a central role in the organization and dissemination of such information.

2. Communication Techniques.

In addition to compiling and organizing information, it is essential that good channels of communication be maintained between all actors during the process of policy formulation. Maintaining good communications insures that there is a ready channel for the exchange of important information and it contributes to building trust among the actors.

Movement toward resolution is dependent on the ability of actors to develop an understanding, and some level of appreciation, of the position of other parties. Because public policy on matters such as school desegregation affects many persons and groups in the community, sound policy is by definition that which is responsive to as many of the concerns and legitimate needs of these groups as possible. Before policy can be responsive, it is necessary that there be an awareness of community concerns and needs. Such awareness comes through good communication and provides a base for discussion, negotiation, and eventual resolution of issues.

There are two basic ways to facilitate communication between the actors in the school desegregation process. One method is to establish structures for information exchange and discussions among the parties. These structures insure that important information comes to public attention and they provide a way of bringing the various actors together in a forum where settlement of issues may be pursued. Citizen task forces or regular exchanges in parent/school organizations are examples.

The second primary mechanism to facilitate communication between the actors in the desegregation process is training in communication skills. Such training serves to make the parties aware of the importance of open and honest discussion between the parties, it can equip the actors with the skills necessary to communicate more effectively and, most importantly, it can help less-experienced persons recognize and counter propaganda and other attempts to control or manipulate the flow of information.

3. Political Organization.

This manual has already noted the importance during the school desegregation process of getting the concerns of the various actors on the public agenda. It is only when major concerns and issues have been firmly established on that agenda that there is reasonable assurance that they will be addressed and dealt with.

Each group which becomes an actor in the school desegregation process is faced with the task of raising the issues which are important to it and winning a sympathetic hearing for those issues. That task is difficult, time-consuming, and costly. There are three basic policital strategies through which groups involved in school desegregation can attempt to insure that their concerns are registered and receive action:

a. Organization and Mobilization of Persons Within Your Own Interest Group. As already noted, the task of getting a group's concerns on the public agenda and winning a hearing for them is a large one. It requires many resources in the form of money, skills, and manpower. If a group is to operate effectively and sustain itself during the often lengthy school desegregation process, it must first organize its supporters to provide assistance and the needed resources. The first task in political action is to establish and maintain a sound organizational base. Establishment of an organizational base requires two primary tasks. One task is enlisting membership to provide a political foundation and needed manpower, and the other is fund-raising to provide the financial support necessary for operation.

b. Promotion of Your Group's Position and Public Relations. Once an organizational base has been established, a group can begin to take its case to the public. A promotions and public relations campaign is the tool for achieving that goal. The basic task is one of organization and dissemination of information that spells out the group's position and provides support for it.

c. Election of Persons Supporting Your Group's Position. On occasion actors in the desegregation process may wish to attempt to elect people to public office who support their position. School board offices (as well as seats on the city council or board of aldermen) are the positions most likely to offer the opportunity to affect the outcome of the desegregation issue. While there may be certain dangers and disadvantages to such "single issue politics" (voting for a candidate for office on the basis of his or her stand on one issue), getting involved in electoral politics is potentially the most effective strategy for influencing policy.

4. Administrative Sanctions.

Existing laws or regulations may, on occasion, be used to resolve issues related to school desegregation. If a school system's practices are in direct violation of a state or federal government agency's regulations or policy, that agency's enforcement powers may be used, or the withholding of funds may be employed, as a lever to achieve compliance. While such administrative sanctions may in certain instances relieve the problem at hand, they may also pose problems. Often enforcement of administrative regulations is not responsive to the real problem or issue and may, in fact, complicate the situation or make it worse rather than improving it.

5. Litigation.

If an actor in the desegregation process feels unable to reach a satisfactory resolution of the issue through some of the approaches listed above, the question of school desegregation may be taken to court.

Litigation is useful when there is suspicion that settlement of the issue outside of court may not meet legal standards or protect the constitutional rights of one or more of the actors. Members of minority groups often feel that the courts are the only official body that offers a reasonable hope of being responsive to their needs and rights. They are, therefore, often committed to litigation from the outset.

While pursuing resolution of school desegregation through the courts has its advantages, it also has serious disadvantages -- the major one being that treatment of the desegregation question as a legal matter may reduce the chances of the matter being addressed as a community issue with broad and far-reaching implications. It is suggested that consideration of the school desegregation question as a broad community issue, rather than a narrow legal one, is essential to successful resolution. The courts are not always equipped to deal with the educational, social, and political matters which bear on resolution of the desegregation question.

Pursuit of resolution of school desegregation through the courts poses other disadvantages. The process of litigation can be extremely time-consuming and costly. Court cases often take many years and cost hundreds of thousands of dollars. Throughout the time legal resolution is being pursued, serious problems may remain unresolved or become more serious. Often the parties with the most at stake find themselves in a desperate struggle just to meet the legal costs required to stay in the case. Finally, the quality of school desegregation plans devised solely by the courts is not always the best, and imposition of a plan by the court often creates problems related to implementation.

6. School System Administrative Action.

As mentioned in the discussion of actors in the desegregation process, the school system possesses a wide range of authority related to the operation of the schools. Often these powers of the school system can be brought to bear to resolve school desegregation problems related to school operations. When problems related to school desegregation involve issues outside of the schools in the broader community, the ability of the school system to act on its own to resolve them is greatly reduced.

7. Training.

Training is a broad area that involves efforts to provide persons with the information, skills, and networks necessary to do a job effectively. It is particularly important when people find themselves in new situations, or faced with a new task with which they are not familiar. The process of school desegregation generates many such situations and tasks.

In the decision stage of the desegregation process, actors need skills and information to develop an understanding of issues, promote their position, and work toward an outcome they consider desirable. In the planning stage actors need skills related to communications, understanding school operations, and program development. Finally, in the implementation stage of desegregation, training may be used to teach the various actors how to operate monitoring and grievance mechanisms, promote good race relations, and resolve operational problems which arise.

While it is not possible to give a full list of all the types of training that might prove helpful during school desegregation, major training needs include:

- Provision of background information (legal, educational, etc.) to facilitate an understanding of the desegregation process.
- Information gathering and analysis skills -- particularly related to school system operations in such areas as budget, programs, administrative organization, policies, and procedures.
- Substantive analysis of such issues as school desegregation law, the nature and function of educational agencies, sources of money and technical assistance, etc.
- Development of communication skills.
- Human relations and race relations skills.
- Curricular options and dealing with curricular changes.
- Use of conflict resolution and management devices -- such as monitoring and grievance mechanisms.
- In-school problem-solving.
- Political and group process skills related to such issues as how to do community organization, how to run a meeting, how to negotiate.

8. Mechanisms for Conflict Resolution.

There are a number of formal, structured, non-legal mechanisms which can be employed during the school desegregation process to manage and resolve conflicts. These mechanisms usually involve formal structured processes for the collection and analysis of information, group deliberation, and decision-making. They also typically involve representatives of the major parties who are actors in the desegregation process, often with the assistance of an impartial third party.

Primary mechanisms for dealing with conflict which can be used during the school desegregation process include:

a. Negotiation/Mediation/Arbitration. A number of structures can be used that allow the major actors in the desegregation process to come together, examine information, deliberate, and work toward settlement of issues. Many private and public organizations offer assistance in establishing negotiation, mediation, or arbitration to assist the parties in desegregating situations. These techniques are, perhaps, most useful in the task of devising a desegregation plan.

b. Monitoring. During the implementation phase of school desegregation, there is a need to collect information on the operation of the schools and come to a determination regarding compliance with the desegregation plan. Traditionally, monitoring commissions have been used to perform this function. These commissions collect information on school operations, evaluate it, and report to the judge and the public. Although the primary function of such commissions often is formally defined as data gathering, they frequently become forums for conflict resolution. Monitoring commissions may, therefore, be regarded as forums for constructively dealing with conflict as well as overseeing implementation.

c. Grievance Procedures. Grievance procedures are a mechanism which can be used to resolve specific complaints that are raised against an institution. In the context of school desegregation, they usually are used to resolve grievances that parents, students or community members have against the school system. Mechanisms for the resolution of grievances which are most likely to be effective are those which (a) extend representation to all involved parties, (b) are regarded as fair, (c) are well-understood by those for whose use they are intended, (d) require written submission of grievances, (e) have a series of levels of appeal available, and (f) contain strict time limits for the processing of grievances.*

* * *

Closely related to the use of various strategies and techniques to resolve issues related to school desegregation is the ability to make wise use of technical assistance. While use of technical assistance cannot be considered a separate "strategy" for resolution of desegregation issues, effective use of such assistance often determines the success of other strategies and techniques which are employed.

There are many technical skills and auxillary services that may be provided during school desegregation to assist in achieving settlement. Usually these skills are possessed by persons or groups who are not major actors in the desegregation process and are not competing for a particular outcome. However, these groups may have some self-interest in the desegregation process and be able to profit from their involvement. Care must be taken not to let competition between technical assistants or their professional self-interests interfere with the settlement of substantive issues.

---

*James H. Laue and Daniel J. Monti, "Student Grievances and Grievance Procedures in a Desegregating School District," in 'Is That Really Fair?' Comments and Responses on the Needs, Purpose, Status, and Functions of Student Grievance Procedures in Public Education, pp. 204-23, Washington: National Institute of Education, 1978.

The skills of technical assistants and services of outside groups can be particularly helpful in such tasks as doing research, developing mechanisms for conflict resolution, and providing training.

* * *

Having reviewed background information regarding (a) the legal framework of school desegregation, (b) individual school desegregation issues, (c) the stages of the desegregation process, (d) the actors who are likely to become involved, and (e) the strategies and techniques for resolution which can be employed, Part II of the manual now turns to methods for seeking resolution at each stage of the process.

PART II. DEALING WITH CONFLICT AND CRISIS IN SCHOOL DESEGREGATION: GOALS AND STRATEGIES FOR COMMUNITY AND SCHOOL GROUPS

Introduction

In this section of the manual an effort is made to put together the elements of the school desegregation process described in Part I in a fashion that can help community and school groups constructively deal with the major issues which arise. This section is intended for use as a handbook by groups involved in the school desegregation question to help them analyze their goals, assess their strengths and weaknesses (and those of other actors in the process), and select strategies which contribute to the constructive resolution of the many issues related to school desegregation.

All approaches to the resolution of social policy issues are based in some set of values. The guidelines and recommendations which are offered here are based on the tenet that the fairest, most effective, and longest-lasting resolution of the school desegregation issue can be achieved through an open community-based process which involves participation at every stage by all of the actors who have a significant stake in the issue. This position has been developed from desegregation field research in St. Louis, a review of school desegregation casework and literature, and participation as mediators and trainers in numerous communities throughout the country. An additional tenet on which the recommendations in this manual are based is that academics, bureaucrats, and researchers can be most helpful in assisting resolution of the desegregation issue by providing frameworks for analysis and action which can be adapted for use by local actors involved in a specific case -- not by trying to offer a rigid prescription to fit every situation.

In Part II of this manual the basic elements of the school desegregation process are drawn together in a framework which, hopefully, will provide assistance to actors involved in school desegregation who are attempting to work toward a resolution of the issue. The desegregation process is divided into three major stages -- Debate and Decision, Planning, and Implementation -- and within each stage strategies available to the various actors which can assist in achieving resolution are examined.

Since persons involved in school desegregation may wish to be able to easily identify the portions of each section that relate specifically to the group with which they are affiliated, the materials for each major group of actors are color-coded as follows:

- The School System -- yellow
- Parents and Students -- green
- Community Leadership -- blue
- Enforcement Agencies -- orange
- Other Interest Groups -- tan

Persons using this manual may turn to the appropriate color-coded section under each of the three stages to review the specific suggestions and guidelines for dealing with desegregation conflicts which relate to individual sets of actors.

The framework around which this section is organized appears in chart form on the next page. The color-coded sections contain the materials noted for each of the cells in the chart.

Since the focus of this handbook is on the importance of community involvement in all phases of the school desegregation process, the framework in which the stages/actors/strategies are brought together is preceeded by a discussion of goals for maintaining a general community climate conducive to constructive resolution of issues.

Analyzing Stages, Strategies and Actors in the School Desegregation Process

	STAGES		
	I Debate and Decision	II Planning	III Implementation
1. School System (yellow)	pp. 79-85	pp. 111-12	pp. 131-136
2. Parents and Students (green)	pp. 87-91	pp. 113-14	pp. 137-38
3. Community Leaders (blue)	pp. 93-96	pp. 115-17	pp. 139-43
4. Enforcement Agencies (orange)	pp. 97-98	pp. 119-21	pp. 145-51
5. Other Interest Groups (tan)	pp. 99-101	pp. 123-24	pp. 153-56

TYPES OF STRATEGIES

1. Informational Strategies
2. Communication Techniques
3. Political Organization
4. Administrative Sanctions
5. Legal Action
6. School System Administrative Action
7. Training
8. Conflict Resolution

Following this section, the heart of the manual appears in the form of guidelines and suggestions for action for each of the actors in each of the stages of school desegregation, as shown in the accompanying chart. Each of the three stages covers a separate section, and each section is organized as follows:

- Introduction
- Major Questions and Issues to be Resolved
- Major Tasks to be Accomplished and Goals to be Achieved
- Primary Strategies for Resolution Appropriate to the Stage

Developing and Maintaining the Proper Community Climate in Which to Pursue Resolution of the Desegregation Issue*

Aside from the specific issues which must be considered and resolved in each stage of the desegregation process, it is important to maintain a general climate which is conducive to reasoned treatment of the desegregation question. The two main components of this climate are the (a) public mood in the community and (b) the way the major actors relate to one another. Conditions which facilitate resolution of the many issues related to school desegregation must be maintained through all three stages of the desegregation process.

Maintenance of the following conditions will establish a positive climate and a sound process through which to pursue resolution of the school desegregation question:

a) Balanced and Reasoned Community Atmosphere. It is important to establish at the outset that resolution of the school desegregation issue can be achieved in a rational, orderly, and participatory manner. Community leaders should stress this from the beginning, and by their leadership and example show that there is no cause for panic, upset, or hasty action. Members of the community will need to know that school desegregation is an issue that can be dealt with successfully. It need not pose a threat to the quality of education or stability of the community.

b) Demographic Stability. Related to the issue of maintaining a balanced and reasoned community atmosphere is the maintenance of the stability of school and community populations. One of the most severe forms of overreaction when faced with the issue of school desegregation is immediate flight from the school system. Flight can take place by physical movement from the school district, or through enrollment of children in private or parochial schools. Such behavior serves to cause panic in the community and worsen problems related to school desegregation by affecting population balance.

---

*For this approach the authors are indebted to the participants in workshops at the University of Missouri-St. Louis in January and February 1979, who represented the public school systems of St. Louis and the Ferguson-Florissant Reorganized District in St. Louis County, parent and student groups from the two systems, a wide range of community leaders, foundation and federal and state officials, and other interest groups. Their names appear at the end of this manual.

c) Maintenance of a Good Climate of Interaction between the Major Parties Pursuing Resolution. Once efforts have been initiated to insure that a reasoned atmosphere and population stability is maintained in the community, attention should turn to the major actors in the desegregation process. If these individuals and groups are to be able to work through difficult and complex problems and come to a successful resolution of issues, it is important to establish processes and maintain a climate that are conducive to reasoned deliberation and sound decision-making. All actors must feel that they (1) have access to the information they need, (2) are being dealt with honestly and fairly by other actors, and (c) have the opportunity to develop at least a basic level of understanding and trust between themselves and the other parties. It is necessary to stress common concerns and the fact that there is a job to be done jointly. Issues of contention that do not relate to resolution of major issues should be played down.

d) Broad Involvement of Community Groups. School desegregation is an issue with far-reaching effects. Many people in the community will be affected by the way the matter is resolved. For the major actors in the desegregation process (the school system, parents, students, etc.) the way the issue is resolved may have major and profound effects. Successful resolution -- resolution which is fair, effective and lasting --

will have to address the concerns of all persons who are affected. It is particularly important that the concerns of the actors who will be affected the most -- the parents and students of all races, social classes, and locations in the district -- are addressed.

In order to best insure that all major issues receive consideration, that they are considered fully and fairly, and that the various actors feel content with the process of deliberation and satisfied with the resolution, a broad range of persons involved in the issue should be included in deliberations and decision-making. A structure for resolution which includes broad representation of affected groups (1) gives them an investment in the process, (2) affords them an opportunity to develop an understanding of the position of other actors, (3) helps bring all parties to an understanding of complex issues, (4) provides parties with the security of seeing how decisions were reached, and (5) lets parties see the compromises and sacrifices made by other groups.

With these general characteristics of climate and process established, resolution of the school desegregation issue can proceed successfully through the three stages of the desegregation process.

STAGE 1 - DEBATE AND DECISION

Conducting Deliberations and Reaching a Decision on Whether to Proceed with Desegregation Efforts

A. Introduction

This first stage of the desegregation process begins when the question of whether a community's schools are segregated is first actively raised. That question may be raised legally in the courts, or in the community as an educational policy issue. Three primary functions are carried out in Stage 1 of the desegregation process:

1. Debate and discussion of the many issues related to school desegregation.
2. Deliberation on these issues.
3. Decision-making regarding whether it is necessary or desirable to proceed with school desegregation efforts.

Developments in Stage 1 of the school desegregation process are particularly important because, in addition to the decisions which are reached on how major issues will be resolved, the foundation is established for the rest of the desegregation process. Relationships between the actors, the tone of deliberations, the role of community leadership, the nature of media coverage, and many other factors which affect the success of the process are established in Stage 1.

In this section of the manual, attention will focus on the major questions and issues to be resolved, the major tasks to be accomplished and goals to be achieved, and the primary strategies available to resolve issues and achieve goals in the first stage of the desegregation process.

B. Major Questions and Issues to be Resolved.

When the question of racial or ethnic segregation in a system's schools becomes an issue on the community's agenda of concerns, it is necessary to examine that matter and determine how to proceed. Once the issue has been raised — either politically or legally — there are four primary questions to be answered:

- Are the system's schools segregated — are a significant number of students racially or ethnically isolated?
- If segregation exists, has it resulted from intentional or forseeable actions of the school system — is the segregation intentional (de jure) or incidental (de facto)? From a legal perspective, the issue is whether there has been constitutional violation on the part of the school system in creating segregation.
- Based on findings related to the existence of segregation and the cause of segregation if it is found to exist, the primary question becomes whether it is legally necessary or educationally desirable to undertake efforts to improve racial an ethnic balance in the school system.
- If a desegregation remedy is attempted what should the extent of that remedy be?

C. Major Tasks to be Accomplished and Goals to be Achieved.

In attempting to answer these questions and come to grips with the issues that they raise, there are a number of specific tasks to be accomplished and goals to be achieved in Stage 1 of the desegregation process. Those tasks and goals include:

1. The need to insure that all persons and groups in the community have access to the information that is necessary to develop an understanding of the school desegregation process and the many related issues.

This information must be accurate, comprehensive, and easily available. Early in the desegregation process, some group or agency in the community should assume responsibility for the collection and organization of information related to the desegregation issue. Since the credibility of that agent is vital, the function should be undertaken by a group which is regarded as essentially objective. This role should not be played by any of the groups who are competitors for a particular outcome.

2. In addition to some group or agency assuming responsibility for the collection and organization of information, it is necessary to establish a network through which needed information can be disseminated to persons in the community. Such a network is probably most easily established and most effective if it employs existing organizational structures and networks in the community.

3. If the school desegregation issue is to be resolved fairly and effectively, it is necessary to insure that the major concerns of all parties are identified, well-formulated, and entered on the agenda of issues to be addressed. Policy decisions or legal settlements can be intelligent and responsive only when they are based on an awareness of all significant problems and concerns. It is the responsibility of each party with an interest in the way the desegregation question is resolved to see that its interests are well-formulated and receive recognition.

4. Fair and effective resolution of issues is greatly enhanced by the establishment of a process of deliberation that allows important questions to be addressed in an open, balanced, and intelligent fashion. That process of deliberation should include all of the actors who have a significant stake in the outcome of the issue.

5. It is necessary that a structure for decision-making be established that allows resolution of each of the four major questions listed above. If decisions are to be accepted and supported, it is important that major actors understand how decisions were reached, feel the process was fair, and have a reasonable chance to influence the final outcomes.

When settlement of the desegregation issue is pursued legally, the courts provide such a decision-making structure. When resolution is sought politically or through policy channels, the decision-making structure of the school system usually provide the major forum for settlement.

D. Primary Strategies for Resolution Appropriate to Stage 1

The item of most interest to participants facing the many unanswered questions, issues, tasks, and goals in the first stage of the desegregation process is: What can the various actors do to bring these matters to resolution? What are the activities which contribute to fair, effective, and lasting settlement -- and what activities interfere with that goal?

As noted earlier, there are no cookbook solutions or foolproof prescriptions for resolving these matters. The nature of the issues and the behavior of the actors vary from time-to-time and place-to-place. There are, however, some general guidelines and frameworks that can be derived from experiences with school desegregation activities across the country that appear to be key elements in achieving successful resolution.

Guidelines and suggestions for dealing with the questions, issues, tasks, and goals which are peculiar to the first stage of the school desegregation process are outlined here in a summary fashion. In order to increase ease of use and reference by actors in the desegregation process, these guidelines and suggestions are categorized by groups of actors.

The School System

Strategies for Resolution in Stage 1 -- Debate and Decision

As noted earlier, the school board bears ultimate legal responsibility for the operation of a community's public schools. When the issue of school desegregation is raised, it is the school system's response that determines to a great extent the future course of events. The system may respond with strategies which facilitate the resolution of issues or which inhibit the process of settlement.

In assessing the position and response of the school system, it may prove helpful to keep in mind that there are few individuals or institutions which react well to accusations that their job performance has been unfair or ineffective. School systems and school board members are no exception. In many instances the first reaction of the school system is one of self-protection. Often the system never moves beyond that initial reflexive response.

Once the issue of school desegregation has been raised, the school system must make a number of basic decisions. If desegregation has been raised as a policy issue, the system must assess the status of racial balance in its schools, determine whether imbalance exists, and decide what steps, if any, should be undertaken to improve the racial and ethnic mix of students.

If school desegregation has been raised as a legal issue in the courts, the school system has two basic options. It may admit responsibility for discriminatory practice and prepare to take whatever corrective action the court may order, or it may deny responsibility for any segregation which exists and defend itself against a finding of liability or the need to implement a desegregation remedy.

Choosing either of these courses of action requires that the school system undertake a specific set of strategies. The key, however, to effective school system action during school desegregation, may lie in the ability of board members and high-ranking administrators to work out a position on the ground bridging the assumption of responsibility for segregation and the task of pursuing remedy. It may well be easier for the school system to move directly and forthrightly toward resolution of the desegregation issue if it does not have to swallow the bitter, and perhaps unfairly administered, pill of liability. The use of court-approved consent decrees in cities such as St. Louis and Atlanta -- agreements in which the school system and other parties agree to pursue some form of remedy and set aside the question of liability -- are examples of attempts to find this middle ground.

There are a number of persuasive arguments for attempting to work around the question of school system liability and move directly to the settlement of major service-related issues. From the perspective of those parties seeking systematic desegregation, it has already been noted that focusing on the issue of school system liability may force the system into a defensive posture. Once this has happened many years and many millions of dollars may be spent deciding the question of whether the school system is liable -- all of which has no direct effect on improving the situation in the schools. Frequently it is those groups who have pushed for desegregation which find themselves in a desparate struggle to remain in the case through this phase of the proceedings. It is, in fact, possible for the school system to actively undertake efforts to draw out the liability phase of Stage 1 in the hope that the financial burden on pro-desegregation actors will force them to drop their case.

The time and expense involved in pursuing the question of liability (particularly in the courts) -- a process which brings no immediate relief from grievances -- could lead pro-desegregation actors to join with the school system in attempts to work around this issue. The argument _for_ pursuing the liability question goes to the heart of the issue of seeking a legal remedy. If actors seeking improvement in racial balance in the systems schools do not feel that the school officials will act in good faith in attempting a desegregation remedy, it is essential that the liability question be resolved. _It is only with a prior finding of school system liability that court-ordered corrective action can be sought_.

The arguments for the school system itself moving directly to face and resolve the desegregation issue are even stronger. If racial and ethnic imbalance exist in the system, the responsiblity of school officials to provide quality education necessitates that they act to correct that situation. An even more practical consideration is the school system's relatively small chance of successful defense should the issue be taken to court. In the great majority of instances in which school desegregation cases have gone to trial, the eventual outcome has been a finding of some degree of school system liability.

Unless the school board members in a community are absolutely certain that no segregation has been caused by school system actions -- and confident that can be proven in court -- there seems little point in devoting years of time and hundreds of thousands of dollars to a defense that is not likely to be successful.

Given these considerations, the school system strategies that contribute most effectively and directly to the resolution of major issues in Stage 1 of the desegregation process are those which focus on realistic resolution of problems related to racial balance. School system activities related to escaping charges of liability and forstalling remedy prove most often to be costly, time-consuming, ineffective, and in the long-run probably counterproductive.

In Stage 1 of the desegregation process, most of the decisions and activities related to school desegregation will involve school board members and high-level system administrators. The recommendations and guidelines offered for the school system in this section apply most directly to those two groups.

Specific school system strategies to facilitate settlement of issues in the first stage of the desegregation process include:

1. Informational and Communications Strategies: Establishment of a System of Data Collection for Information Related to the Racial and Ethnic Composition of the System's Schools.

Once the issue of school desegregation has been raised, there will be an immediate need for information about the make-up of the student population in the system's schools. Detailed information on the racial and ethnic characteristics of students, both system-wide and in individual schools, will be required to give an accurate picture of the situation. Historical data showing the patterns of the racial and ethnic make-up of the schools over time will be required in addition to current data. There also will be intense focus on school system policies and practices which may have affected the racial and ethnic composition of the schools.

The best source of this information usually is school system records. There are a variety of reasons why it is in the best interest of the school system, the other actors, and the desegregation process itself for the school system to collect and organize this information in an accurate, comprehensive, and clear fashion.

First, if the response of the school system is to be intelligent, fair, and effective, it will have to be based on the best available information. Collection and organization of such information is important to the school system's formulation of its own position.

Second, the records in question are public information. There will be numerous requests from other actors in the process for data. If the school system is to meet its obligation to provide public information, reduce its own administrative and staff burden in compiling and distributing such information, and avoid creating frustration and ill-will in the community, it is to its advantage to establish a centralized effective mechanism for information organization and dissemination.

Finally, should the desegregation issue end up in court, possession of such information will be crucial to the school system's support of its legal case.

2. Training of School Board Members and School Administrators.

The response of the school system to the desegregation issue will be shaped through a series of decisions related to school operations and system policies. These decisions will be made by school board members and top system administrators. If the stance of the school system on the desegregation issue is to be intelligent and responsive, it must be based in a thorough understanding of the desegregation issue.

Early in the desegregation process -- as soon as it becomes apparent that desegregation is going to a major issue facing the schools -- the school system should secure the training that is necessary to provide board members and administrators with the data and information required to develop a thorough understanding of the school desegregation issue. That training should cover the legal and educational aspects of the desegregation process, a review of desegregation techniques, the financial aspects of the process, and the lessons learned from experiences in other cities. There are many national and local sources of such assistance.

3. Adoption of a Problem-Solving Orientation to the Desegregation Issue.

The school system should make every possible effort to avoid being forced into a defensive posture. Its response should instead focus on problem-solving efforts to resolve the issues which have been raised. From the perspective of all of the actors in the process, the extensive resources of the school system are most profitably and effectively used if they are employed to face issues and settle them, rather than in attempting to avoid them and escape their consequences.

This recommendation is not a suggestion that the school system abandon its direction of the schools or promotion of its own interest. It is rather a recognition of the fact (1) that some problems related to racial balance are likely to exist in the schools, (2) that once the school system adopts a defensive posture the desegregation process is likely to become extremely time-consuming, costly, and devisive, and (3) that if the issue is pushed to a final legal settlement the system is not likely to be successful in its defense.

When debate of the desegregation issue goes on without resolution, racial balance in the system may become worse and the quality of education decline. A drawn-out process of settlement can take a severe toll on many aspects of community life, and pursuit of settlement though adversarial legal proceedings may well result in the school system sacrificing some degree of control over the operation of the schools to the courts.

Clearly there is one best strategy for the school system to employ in resolving issues related to school desegregation. That strategy is for the system to use the broad range of powers it possesses to actively confront issues and pursue resolution, rather than trying to avoid treatment of the desegregation issue.

Parents and Parent Groups

Strategies for Resolution in Stage 1 — Debate and Decision

Parental involvement in the school desegregation issue usually is initiated by minority parents who believe that their children are the victims of racially or ethnically discriminatory school system practices. In seeking relief from this perceived discrimination, parents supporting systematic efforts to desegregate the systems' schools may pursue a number of courses to achieve that goal. The school system may be approached directly with a request for action to relieve the situation, the issue may be raised in the general community as a political issue, or the issue may be taken to court and legal resolution pursued.

If minority parents supporting systematic desegregation efforts are successful in establishing the issue as one that the community must deal with and resolve, that is almost certain to trigger parental involvement from opponents of systematic efforts to desegregate. These opponents of systematic desegregation efforts may base their opposition on (1) a feeling that the schools are not segregated, (2) opposition to racial integration, (3) the belief that there is no legal basis for pursuing remedy, or (4) a conviction that while segregation exists, any programmatic attempts to correct it will be unsuccessful or have major undesirable side effects.

Successful resolution of the desegregation issue is dependent on the ability of parental groups on both sides of the question to formulate and promote their positions, conduct deliberations with other actors involved with the issue, and develop an understanding of the nature and workings of the school desegregation process. The following strategies can be of assistance to parents groups in working toward successful resolution:

1. Collection and Organization of Information.

Parental groups involved in the desegregation issue must begin by gathering the information that is necessary to support their position and make their case. Parents have a great deal of information from their own experience and contacts with other parents and students. Initially, however, it is not likely that information will be collected systematically or well-organized. When parents' groups first decide to become involved in the desegregation issue, they must begin by employing the informational strategies that will allow them to formulate their position. In short, they must collect the facts and figures that provide a clear and precise picture of the racial situation which exists in the schools and the school system policies and practices related to that situation. The information must be put together in a fashion that is accurate, understandable, and well-organized. Because the process of information collection and organization is often technical and time-consuming, parents may wish to seek outside assistance.

2. Political Organization.

As parents groups come to a determination that they want to become involved in the desegregation issue and begin to collect data and information, they will also want to begin political organization. Political activity at this stage should take two forms.

First it is necessary to begin organizing and mobilizing persons who are potential supporters. Establishment of a sound organizational base is necessary to provide the manpower and resources that are required to pursue resolution of the desegregation issue. During this process of political organization, a decision will have to be made on whether local parents groups want to pursue resolution of the matter on their own or seek outside support and assistance. Assistance from an outside group that is sympathetic to the goals and position of the parents group can bring legal assistance, political skills, or financial support. Usually, however, the cost of that assistance is some loss of group autonomy and independence. Parental groups will have to decide the value of making such trade-offs.

After an informational and organizational base has been established, parental groups will be ready to move to the second stage of political activity. This stage entails promotion and publication of the group's position to insure that its concerns are registered on the agenda of issues to be addressed. It is only when the major elements of the group's position have been so registered that there can be reasonable assurance that they will receive consideration in settlement of the school desegregation issue.

3. Establishment of Structures for Discussion Among the Parties.

If actors in the school desegregation process -- especially parental actors -- are to involve themselves in the issue successfully, it is essential that their position be well-formulated and their organizational base firmly established. Performance of those functions does not, however, initiate movement toward resolution of issues. Once each of the major actors is established as a participant in the process (this task is often most difficult for parents groups), it is necessary to begin establishing forums that will bring these actors together so that resolution of issues can be sought. The establishment of such structural forums will promote exchange of information between the actors, encourage discussion and debate of issues, establish a base for compromise, and contribute to selection of a vehicle for decision-making. More details about establishing such structures are included in the next section on "Community Leaders."

4. Pursuit of Legal Remedy.

After parental groups are established and have begun to explore the possible avenues of resolution, they will have to make a basic and fundamental decision. That decision is whether they should pursue resolution from the political base they have established in the community, or expand their strategies to include pursuit of legal avenues of resolution.

If a decision is made not to proceed legally, parents may sacrifice (at least temporarily) one of the most powerful tools at their disposal for obtaining resolution of their grievances. This is a particularly vital decision for minority groups who frequently have found that the judicial system and courts offer them the only real opportunity for progress in their cause.

On the other hand, as previously noted, a decision to take legal action has its own disadvantages. Because the process of litigation is time-consuming and costly, parents who bring suit may be initiating a process in which it will be difficult for them to maintain involvement. Over time the financial burden of litigation will become severe, and the legal process may drag on, putting years between the time legal action is initiated and a settlement reached. There may be problems, as well, with the quality and enforcement of the legal settlement.

By failing to pursue available legal avenues for resolution, parental actors may be giving up one of the most effective tools available for obtaining the settlement they want. By initiating legal action parental actors will almost certainly increase the cost of achieving resolution -- and they may sacrifice the opportunity of obtaining an early favorable resolution for the possibility of winning a questionable settlement many years in the future.

Community Leaders

Strategies for Resolution in Stage 1 — Debate and Decision

As noted earlier, the primary role of community leaders in this initial stage of the desegregation process is in establishing the community atmosphere in which the issue of school desegregation will be addressed. Business, religious, educational, neighborhood, and civic leaders can largely determine whether the community's response to school desegregation is rational and harmonious, or emotional and devisive. Formation of a coalition of leaders representing all segments of the community which will be affected by the way the desegregation issue is resolved can provide the tool necessary to insure that the prevailing community atmosphere is positive and constructive.

In reviewing the activities in cities throughout the U.S., it appears that one of the most important considerations in establishing a positive and effective leadership coalition is the stance which that group adopts in the desegregation process. It is essential that in this initial stage the coalition not become embroiled in debating legal issues or become an advocate for any particular desegregation plan. Determination of school system liability in a given desegregation case, or development of a plan to be imposed in remedy, are judicial functions. They are not matters in which the coalition usually should become involved.

What members of the leadership coalition should advocate in the early stages of deliberation on the issue is fair and equal treatment of all students and a sound system of quality education. To that end, members of the coalition should adopt a stance supporting public education, respect for the law, and concern for the welfare of the community and the safety of its children. These leaders can also be instrumental in conveying the message that the desegregation issue is one that the community can deal with successfully -- that there is no cause for panic or flight.

The second essential feature of any community coalition which wishes to affirmatively and effectively address issues related to school desegregation is that it be broadly based. The term "leadership coalition" must not be construed to imply only a collection of the established community-wide leaders. The coalition must instead bring together representatives of all groups in the community which will be affected by school desegregation and who need to have a role in determining its outcome. Such a group can provide the leadership which is necessary to see the community through the desegregation process.

Established community leaders should, of course, be included in the coalition -- and the political dynamics of most American cities will insure that they are. It is critical, however, that a concerted effort be made to include adequate representation from those groups who are often overlooked or pushed aside in the community's decision-making process. Racial and ethnic minorities, neighborhood-level organizations, and groups which are likely to be opposed to desegregation are included in this category. Finally, it is essential that the citizens coalition contain a strong and representative group of parents, for it is the parents and their children who are the ultimate consumers of the educational system's services.

While there are a variety of ways in which a leadership coalition might be organized, whatever structure is employed must maximize the impact of the community's human resources. The coalition's structure should serve to facilitate its ability to perform three vital functions: 1) problem recognition and definition, 2) resource identification, and 3) application of problem-solving techniques.

An organizational arrangement which has been used in many communities, and which gives indications of being workable, is formation of a series of coalitions with geographical as well as functional bases within the community. Under such a scheme, coalitions might be formed in such functional areas as business, religion, labor, education, politics, and volunteer groups, as well as in geographically-based parents' groups. Representatives from those groups then would form a central coordinating body. Such an arrangement allows individual coalitions to develop a specific focus and make best use of their individual skills and expertise, while simultaneously allowing for cooperation and coordination between the groups.

Specific strategies to be employed by such a leadership coalition in attempting to establish a positive and constructive community environment in which to deal with the school desegregation issue include:

- Designation, endorsement, or creation of a group to serve as a central source of information related to the desegregation process.
- Establishment of a mechanism for information dissemination.
- Encouragement of local print and electronic media to provide comprehensive and balanced coverage of the desegregation process.
- Helping in the provision of technical assistance to the school system, parents groups, and other actors in the school desegregation process through direct participation, funding, etc.
- Encouragement of the members of the individual groups which leaders represent to approach school desegregation in a rationale and constructive fashion and to make available their resources which can contribute to resolution of the issue.

- Issuance of a joint public statement early in the desegregation process supporting orderly, fair, and peaceful behavior.
- Political coordination to avoid in-fighting among groups in the community over who controls or directs the desegregation process.
- Establishment of a strong community ethic which encourages politicians and political groups not to exploit the desegregation issue.
- In cases where a strong system of private and parochial schools exists, attempting to insure that the leadership of those schools does not allow them to become havens for people fleeing the public school system.

Enforcement Agencies

Strategies for Resolution in Stage 1 -- Debate and Decision

When school desegregation is in the early stages of debate, administrative enforcement agencies often are free to take action to rectify complaints related to school system policies and practices and racial and ethnic balance in the schools. Once the issue has been taken to court, however, these enforcement agencies may find that they are operating under legal constraints which require or preclude action.

While it is difficult to prescribe specific actions to be taken by administrative enforcement agencies -- such as state boards of education or federal agencies -- two general guidelines can be offered.

1. Even before school desegregation is raised as an issue, state educational agencies should review conditions, policies, and practices in local school districts to see that they are in compliance with state educational policies. Failure to do so may be interpreted as a state's abdication of its legal responsibility and may make the state liable as a defendant if legal action is taken.

2. When federal agencies are contemplating use of administrative or fiscal sanctions to alter the policies or practices of a local educational agency, every effort should be made to insure that the required changes effectively address the problem at hand. Bureaucratic regulations that are formulated and enforced without sensitivity to conditions in local school systems may complicate or worsen the problems they are intended to solve.

The court is the enforcement agency which usually figures most prominently in the first stage of the desegregation process. In a large percentage of cases, one party or another will initiate legal action and the court will become the forum for resolution of many of the issues related to school desegregation.

The court is well structured and equipped to handle the legal matters which come before it, but, as noted before, school desegregation is an issue with consequences which extend beyond the legal arena. Two strategies in particular may prove helpful to courts in handling the desegregation issue.

- Once the desegregation question has been taken to court, there will be a strong tendency in the schools and community to leave all aspects of the issue to legal resolution. The court itself can, through its orders, findings, and decisions, help the community sort out those tasks that are appropriate to the court and those which are important, but beyond the court's jurisdiction and expertise. The court may even use its powers to encourage other groups in the community to assume responsibility for performing these functions.

- The court should secure the technical assistance and expert skills that are required to address the educational and social issues related to school desegregation intelligently and effectively. Although the judge sits as a legal expert, he or she will be required to deal with many questions and issues that extend beyond the law. It is only through soliciting expert opinion and enlisting technical assistance that the court can hope to hand down a legal finding -- and perhaps a remedy -- that is educationally and socially responsive as well as legally sound.

Enforcement Agencies

Strategies for Resolution in Stage 1 -- Debate and Decision

When school desegregation is in the early stages of debate, administrative enforcement agencies often are free to take action to rectify complaints related to school system policies and practices and racial and ethnic balance in the schools. Once the issue has been taken to court, however, these enforcement agencies may find that they are operating under legal constraints which require or preclude action.

While it is difficult to prescribe specific actions to be taken by administrative enforcement agencies -- such as state boards of education or federal agencies -- two general guidelines can be offered.

1. Even before school desegregation is raised as an issue, state educational agencies should review conditions, policies, and practices in local school districts to see that they are in compliance with state educational policies. Failure to do so may be interpreted as a state's abdication of its legal responsibility and may make the state liable as a defendant if legal action is taken.

2. When federal agencies are contemplating use of administrative or fiscal sanctions to alter the policies or practices of a local educational agency, every effort should be made to insure that the required changes effectively address the problem at hand. Bureaucratic regulations that are formulated and enforced without sensitivity to conditions in local school systems may complicate or worsen the problems they are intended to solve.

The court is the enforcement agency which usually figures most prominently in the first stage of the desegregation process. In a large percentage of cases, one party or another will initiate legal action and the and community. If the federal government is overly accusatory and judgmental in the manner in which it pursues the liability question, the result may be to make the local school system adopt a defensive and uncooperative posture.

Because its base for involvement is purely legal, the Justice Department cannot be asked to set aside the liability issue. Any ability to pursue remedy is dependent on a finding of school system violation. The Justice Department can, however, couch its efforts so the primary focus is on problem-solving and improvement of conditions in the schools, rather than indictment of the local school system.

3. Technical Assistants.

Technical assistants can bring a wide range of information and skills to bear on resolution of the desegregation issue. They can help to establish a common factual base of information from which to seek resolution and they can facilitate the settlement of issues by equipping the various actors with needed skills. Technical assistants also can be instrumental in establishing structures and mechanisms for decision-making and problem-solving.

It is critical, however, that technical assistants make sure their efforts facilitate the process of achieving settlement rather than interfering with it. There are two areas where both the technical assistants and the other actors in the desegregation process need to focus attention to insure that activities of technical assistants are having a positive rather than negative impact:

- Technical assistants -- universities, foundations, and agencies, for example -- have interests of their own related to the desegregation process. While these groups may not be pushing for a particular substantive resolution of issues -- either pro or anti school desegregation -- they may well have interests related to financial reward, research, and influence over the process. The simple rule to be kept in mind is that the involvement of technical assistants should contribute primarily to the treatment of the school desegregation issue. School desegregation should not be used as a vehicle for serving the interests of technical assistance groups.

- The other danger related to the involvement of technical assistants is that they often become competitors for control or recognition in certain aspects of the desegregation process. The process of school desegregation encompasses enough competing points of view and potential divisiveness without more being interjected by groups which are supposed to be facilitating settlement. There are numerous tasks related to school desegregation which require technical assistance. Technical assistance groups should strive to divide these tasks among themselves constructively, and the influence of community leaders should be used to insure that each task is performed successfully.

STAGE 2 -- PLANNING

Planning for School Desegregation

A. Introduction

Planning -- the formal process of tying means to ends to achieve desired results -- occurs continually on the part of many of the actors in the school desegregation process. The Planning Stage in school desegregation begins formally when a school district and the other actors recognize the reality of a decision to desegregate and become involved both in (a) formulating a plan to implement the decision and (b) making specific preparations to implement the plan.

The plan-formulation process varies from community to community regarding a number of characteristics. It:

- may be formal or informal;
- may be undertaken by one person (a judge, a court-appointed "master", or a school district official, for example) or by many and diverse parties;
- may be open or secretive;
- may have a short or long lead-time to implementation; and
- may or may not overlap with the prior stage (Decision) and the following stage (Implementation).

Effective planning cannot proceed unless there is widespread recognition that some degree of desegregation will occur. The "massive resistance" movement in the South following the 1954 Brown decision is an example of the inability of the process to move successfully, without crisis, from the decision stage to the planning stage. More recently, in Boston official and vocal resistance to acceptance of the court's decision existed in both the school system and the city council for more than a year after the decision. Even the mayor's office was not willing to take a firm stance in support of court-ordered desegregation. Effective planning therefore was not possible, for energies still were largely directed to the essentially political activities of Stage I.

B. Major Questions and Issues to be Resolved

Here, as at every other point in the process, full and authentic *involvement of all the parties affected by school desegregation is essential if the plan developed is to be successful* -- if it is to meet the three requirements of educational quality, compliance with the law, and broad community acceptability. This is not a quick or easy process, and persons entering this stage should be prepared for heavy investment of time in resolving complex issues.

If a *successful* plan is to be developed, the parties must face and resolve the following questions and issues to their mutual satisfaction:

1. Who shall have the authority to devise the plan, and who shall be represented in the process?
2. What process will be used to devise the plan?
3. What kind and what degree of desegregation can be reasonably achieved?
4. What specific desegregation techniques shall be employed, and with what degree of parental and student choice? Student transportation? Reassignment of students? Reassignment of teachers? Curricular modifications? Reorganization of school buildings' functions and/or attendance zones?
5. How can the quality of education be maintained or improved?
6. What will the plan cost -- and how will it be financed?

It should be noted, however, that it is not always possible to resolve each of these questions to the satisfaction of all the parties. Some times the court simply requires the school board to act. On occasion the board may be faced with insufficient funds to implement a plan. Nevertheless, the goal of negotiating the plan with all the stakeholders involved should be pursued as the ideal if the plan is to enjoy widespread acceptance.

Of these six major questions or issues, the first two are most important -- for how they are answered will determine the outcomes of the following four more specific questions. Determing who shall be represented in formulating the plan and how it shall be done are the key decisions during this phase. As is clear in the goals and guidelines that follow, it is suggested that the answer to the "Who?" question is all parties with a major stake in the plan and the schools. And the answer to the "How?" question is through an open process of negotiation within established guidelines and with ample technical assistance. More specific answers emerge in the section below on the roles of the various actors in school desegregation.

C. Major Tasks to be Accomplished and Goals to be Achieved

There are four major goals which must be accomplished in this stage of the desegregation process if conflicts are to be successfully resolved and crises avoided.

1. Develop a process for involving all the actors affected by desegregation. Unless all the parties with a major stake in the outcomes are involved in the planning, any plan devised will be open to attack and thus itself can be a source of crisis. One model for effective plan formulation upon a finding of school system liability is for the court to order the representatives of all the affected parties to work jointly to develop a plan under the supervision of the court and within a stringent time limit. Ordering the parties to engage in a

planning process is in sharp contrast to the usual procedure of ordering a specific plan.

2. Devise a fair and comprehensive school desegregation plan that meets the three standards of educational quality, community acceptability, and legal compliance. Whether the plan is both fair and comprehensive -- and perceived as fair and comprehensive by the major actors -- will be very much a result of who is involved and how it is done. This manual does not propose any specific content for a school desegregation plan to meet these criteria. It only reminds all parties in the local district that such a plan can emerge only from specific applications of the principles of educational, community, and legal acceptability within a process of joint plan formulation by representatives of all parties who have a stake in the outcome -- especially parents, students, and school officials.

3. Begin planning for implementation. There are at least two parts to any good plan: one is the plan itself, and the other is outlining and agreeing on a specific set of steps for implementation of the plan. As with the plan itself, the steps for implementation must be clear, understandable and acceptable to all parties -- and communicated widely in the district's constituent communities.

4. Establish an atmosphere conductive to implementation. Even the best plan -- educationally sound, legally compliant, politically acceptable, and devised with an open and highly participatory process -- will fall short unless an atmosphere conducive to implementation is established. The essential elements for building and maintaining a constructive community atmosphere during this stage include (a) broad communication of the elements and steps of the plan, (b) availability and receptivity

of school and other officials to answer questions about the plan, and (c) strong leadership from the media and business, political, and religious institutions.

D. Primary Strategies for Resolution Appropriate to Stage 2

In every stage, some of the strategies described in the first part of this manual are moee appropriate for moving the process ahead successfully than others. The strategies applied during Stage II must pay particular attention to the existing inequalities among the parties in knowledge, skills, community prestige, money, and other resources -- and be aimed at protecting their rights in the planning as well as implementation phases. Parents and students in particular may have exhausted their resources and energy in a court battle and may not recognize that recently won rights are not automatically implemented without constant informed participation by all the parties -- especially the ultimate clients.

Some of the most important strategies to be applied by the various groups during Stage 2 are listed below.

1. Negotiation/Mediation. Establishing a broad forum in which all actors' interests can be represented in joint formulation of the plan is the first and most important goal of this stage, and negotiation/mediation strategies are the best way to reach this goal. By definition, joint plan formulation requires the give-and-take of the negotiation process. The adversarial nature of litigation or formal hearings is inappropriate. Administrative fiat by Federal or state governments or by school system officials may carry formal authority, but will lack community credibility unless all parties are in a negotiating stance within the guidelines

established by the desegregation decision. However, parent and student groups in particular should take care not to negotiate away rights established by law or court action, including those which may have been recently granted in litigation on the local case.

2. *Training*. Perhaps at no other stage is training as important, for the parties vary greatly in their level of experience and abilities in data-gathering, drawing attendance zones, developing curriculum, determining transportation patterns, personnel management, negotiation -- all the highly technical and specific skills that must be employed in plan formulation. *Citizen training is the major task that must be accomplished if there is to be an "evening of the odds" between professionals and lay persons at this stage, so truly joint planning may proceed.*

3. *Improving and Broadening the Base of Available Information*. Research to clarify issues, to generate alternative steps, and to provide data for planning is essential to formulating the plan. A common information base for all the actors can help overcome the natural strong advantage school systems hold over all the other parties in this stage where possession of technical information is so critical to decisions.

4. *Establishing and Improving Communications Networks*. The establishment -- or reestablishment from Stage 1 -- of firm communication networks is essential to sound plan development and the early stages of implementation. Rumor control also depends on good communication techniques and solid networks. Building such networks and training in communications techniques are appropriate approaches for all the parties involved at this stage.

5. *Maintaining and Improving Broad Political Support*. While Stage 1 is the predominant stage for political action, such activities as

community organizing and electoral politics may be appropriate in Stage 2 if some positions are not receiving adequate representation in the planning process or sufficient responsiveness from school and other officials.

* * *

For each of the groups of actors specific guidelines and suggestions for intervention strategies during Stage 2 now are offered. As with the strategies listed in the other two stages in this section, it must be noted that these guidelines are intended to represent a range of useful activities for the actors, and must be adapted to local conditions if they are to be effective.

Strategies for Resolution in Stage 2 -- Planning

The Board of Education is in many ways the central actor during the planning stage, for it has both the authority and the responsibility for devising and implementing any desegregation which is ordered or voluntarily chosen. But the significant involvement of all the parties with a stake in the outcome is mandatory if the conflicts inherent in this stage are to be adequately addressed and not just temporarily restrained.

Specific adaptations of intervention strategies to be followed at this stage include:

1. Board of Education.
    - Accept the legal and moral responsibility for coordinating the development of a fair and comprehensive plan.
    - Encourage negotiation of all issues and all elements of the plan with all affected parties, with the assistance of a mediator if necessary.
    - Communicate the message at every available opportunity that the welfare of children and their effective education is the Board's highest priority.
    - Develop clear policy choices, adequately documented, and clearly communicated.
2. System-wide School Administrators and Staff.
    - Support and promote through all communication channels available the policies of the Board noted above.
    - Provide adequate information to all parties involved so issues and alternatives are well understood, and maintain full two-way communication regarding other views.
    - Offer training in understanding the technical details of school desegregation planning to all who wish it.
    - Emphasize choice for students and parents wherever possible in all phases of school operations.
3. Principals.
    - Be involved early and fully in the district's planning for desegregation.

- Begin regular activities with new parents whose children will be attending your school as a result of desegregation.

- Assess the information level and needs of the teachers, staff, students, and parents at your site, and see that the needs are met.

- Develop a plan for orientation and training of personnel in your building in all phases of school desegregation -- intercultural relations, curricular needs, teacher ability, etc.

- Create or strengthen student government, and your lines of communication with all factions among the students -- black and white, "old" and "new", etc.

4. Teachers.

- Conduct a needs assessment regarding curriculum adequacy and preparation of the teachers at the site level, to be ready for training and planning.

- Support training for teachers and encourage teachers to be available for after-school work with the new students and new issues, and for home visits.

- Be well-organized and have a solid communication network so people and skills can be readily mobilized to deal with potential conflicts and crises.

5. Building Staff.

- Achieve full and early representation in all planning activities at the building level.

- Strengthen communication with teachers, principal, and, where appropriate, central administration, to avoid the overlooking of staff in the dissemination of critical information.

- Be well-organized and have a solid communication network so people and skills can be readily mobilized to deal with potential conflicts and crises.

- Conduct your own needs assessment and ask for training in the areas relating to desegregation and school change where you determine the greatest needs to be.

Parents and Students

Strategies for Resolution in Stage 2 -- Planning

Regardless of whether desegregation is an issue, parents, students, and the groups representing them have more at stake than any other sets of actors in the school setting -- for they ultimately pay for the educational services offered by the school system and must live with the outcomes of school system policies. Yet they are among the least formally powerful of the actors, for, as with most client groups, they generally are not organized to advocate for their needs as a group. Institutions are permanently organized; they have budgets and full-time paid personnel to look after their needs. Parents and students may have only their temporary status as service-users at the same school or in the same neighborhood in common. Ensuring that parents and students are represented in the planning process and have adequate technical preparation to participate is, therefore, the most important focus for parent and student intervention strategies during this stage.

Appropriate strategies for students, parents, parent groups, and student groups include:

- Acquire training in negotiation, data-gathering, and other planning skills.
- Organize by neighborhoods, schools, and system-wide to insure full representation in the planning process.
- Gather data and find assistance in data-gathering.
- Develop newsletter and telephone chains for continuous and, when necessary, instantaneous communication.
- Engage in electoral politics -- run for school board, city council, student government, and other organizations with formal political power regarding school operations.
- Seek technical assistance from outside groups in the form of legal advice, training, information gathering, curricular information, etc.

- Monitor the planning process to see that parent and student needs are being adequately addressed, and that parents and students continue to be fully represented in all aspects of the process of joint plan formulation.

Community Leadership

Strategies for Resolution in Stage 2 -- Planning

Community leaders are reminded of the statement by John Buggs, Staff Director of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, cited earlier in this manual: "The single most important ingredient in achieving peaceful and successful desegregation is affirmative leadership by those entrusted with that community's social, economic, educational, political, and religious institutions."

The requirements for effective intervention in school desegregation are similar for all the various components of community leadership:

- Sustained regular advocacy for compliance with the law during the Planning stage -- and for nonviolent action through to the final appeal when laws are believed to be unjust.
- Utilization of the far-reaching, pre-established networks of communication that characterize all community leadership groups for dissemination of information about the planning process.
- Watchful encouragement of open sharing of information by the school system and of a fully representative planning process.
- Development of broad-based coalitions among groups both at community-wide and neighborhood levels, and between groups at these two levels.
- Observation of the planning process and communication to the court or other authorities involved of the community climate and the needs of broad groups of citizens.
- Provision of financial support for the planning process and for quality educational services through political leadership in maintaining an adequate school tax base, as well as direct financing or endowment for some aspects of the educational program.
- Continuing concerted attacks on other vestiges of discrimination in the district: red-lining, housing segregation, jobs, etc.

Specific intervention strategies for the various segments of community leadership include:

1. Business Leaders.
    - Contribution of important resources to the major groups in the planning process (schools, parents, students): management

consultation, training personnel and programs, facilities for negotiation sessions, etc.

- Promotion of policies of nondiscrimination and fairness with their own employees.

2. Political Leaders.

- Early and unequivocal public statements in support of the duely-developed decision to desegregate.
- Avoidance of exploitation of sensitive issues to enhance their political position in the community.

3. Religious Leaders.*

- Regular statements from the pulpit in support of peaceful and constructive compliance.
- Formation or strengthening of ties among the clergy and denominational officials in the community (an interdenominational ministerial alliance is a common format).
- Provision of study opportunities for congregational members on the facts of the desegregation situation.
- Provision of national denominational specialists in school desegregation planning and community relations when warranted.

4. Neighborhood Leaders.

- Work to insure that constituents have the information and skills necessary to participate effectively in the planning process.
- Maintenance of open communication between neighborhood level persons who are formally involved in the planning process and their neighborhood constituencies.
- Encouragement of neighborhood-based groups and their representatives to adopt a view of planning that balances local needs and desires with the welfare of the entire community.

5. Educational Leaders.

- Stress the importance of upholding the provision of good quality education to all students and maintenance of the welfare of all children as the primary considerations which should guide all planning decisions.

---

*See Appendix B, "St. Louis Congregations and School Desegregation: A Time for Study and Action, 1978" for a more detailed set of suggested activities adapted to a specific community.

- University administrators can make available the resources of departments skilled in planning, budgeting, organizational development, human relations, etc., for consultation and training with the parties.

6. Civil Rights Leaders

- Work to insure that the groups which they represent secure the information and skills necessary to participate effectively in the planning process.

- Encourage constituent groups to shift from the primarily political stance appropriate to Stage 1 to adopt a strong problem-solving orientation during the planning stage.

Enforcement Agencies

Strategies for Resolution in Stage 2 -- Planning

1. State and Federal Educational Agencies.

The role which enforcement and regulatory agencies play during the planning stage will be determined in large part by whether the desegregation programs to be planned and implemented are voluntary or court-ordered.

Voluntary desegregation efforts that are undertaken by the school system will permit a range of activities by the regulatory and enforcement agencies that are usually involved in school system operations and policy formulation. During the planning activities sponsored by the school system, both federal educational enforcement agencies and the state department of education should actively monitor decisions which are made to insure that they are consistent with the operating regulations and policy guidelines those agencies have adopted. Insofar as federal and state agencies are able to provide needed information, technical assistance, or fiscal support, there is often the opportunity for them to play an expanded role in the planning process. In examining the role of "outside" state and federal agencies, the caution should once again be added that their intervention should be based on careful study of local issues and a reasonable assurance that their actions will improve conditions in the local schools rather than aggravating them.

Specific strategies appropriate to state and federal educational agencies during the planning stage include:

- Notification of local actors of the regulations and policy guidelines that any plan which is developed will be expected to meet.
- Provision of information and technical assistance to the local school system, if it is available and requested.
- Provision of fiscal support for appropriate aspects of the planning process, if it is available and requested.

2. The Courts.

If the desegregation question is pursued legally and litigation results in a decision that school system violation has occurred and a remedy should be implemented, primary responsibility for the development of a school desegregation plan will fall to the court. It will be court's job to select a method of plan-formulation, and to review the plan once it has been developed to insure that it is politically reasonable, legally compliant, and educationally sound.

Strategies for plan formulation which may prove of benefit to the court include:

- Securing the technical assistance that is needed to help the court come to grips with the complex educational issues and sensitive political questions that are an inherent part of school desegregation planning.
- Insuring that there is a vehicle for information dissemination that allows accurate information regarding planning to be transmitted to the community so that suspicion and fears are minimized.
- Selection of a method of plan formulation that maximizes the opportunities for development of a sound and workable plan. In keeping with the principal tenet of this manual -- that broad participation of all the major actors with a stake in the issue is crucial to successful resolution -- it is suggested that the vehicle for plan formulation involve those groups in the community that will be affected in a significant way by the plan. Such a method of plan formulation allows groups in the community to develop an investment and sense of ownership in the plan by allowing them to have in-put, see how their suggestions are processed and witness the sacrifices and trade-offs made by other parties.

A method for joint plan development under court supervision is detailed in one of the documents cited in the first section of this manual.* This method of plan development involves the major actors in the desegregation process in a structured system of plan formulation. There is no expectation or requirement for the parties to come to agreement on every aspect of the plan under this system. The process is a tool for use by the court in the development of a plan which addresses all of the primary concerns of the major actors, and which attempts to provide for making the psychological accommodations and political compromises which must be made. As with other methods of plan development by the court, the judge retains the authority to amend or expand the plan as he or she sees fit.

---

*Patton and Laue, op cit.

Other Interest Groups

Strategies for Resolution in Stage 2 -- Planning

While the development of a plan is the responsibility of the school system -- whether or not the plan is court-ordered -- there are important roles for all the groups who have been involved in the community's school desegregation issue during this stage. The most pressing need is for the groups who may have been opponents during the Decision stage to find at least some common base in the welfare of the children so they can continue to represent their interests as a specific plan is formulated.

Suggested strategies for such groups during Stage 2 include the following:

1. Pro-Desegregation Groups.

   - Utilize their contacts with national organizations and the local networks built during Stage 1 to secure the resources necessary to effectively participate in plan formulation -- training in planning, budgeting, the use of technical experts, etc.

   - Maintain a strong political base to be able to act as a monitor or watchdog for the planning process to see that all the problems which were the subject of the Stage 1 deliberations are addressed in the plan.

2. Anti-Desegregation Groups.

   - Secure training in the necessary skills for participation in planning -- and participate -- so the concerns of parents and students with strong anti-desegregation feelings are addressed in the planning.

3. Technical Assistance Groups.

   - Universities, research centers, foundations, and certain government agencies should make such services as data provision, training, and consultation available to the groups involved in the planning process -- especially the various parent factions and other groups generally lacking in the technical knowledge or skills to participate effectively in developing a plan.

4. Media.

   - City-wide and neighborhood-based media -- electronic and print -- should meet as soon as the planning phase begins to develop a plan for coverage of the planning process. Such coverage should include in-depth feature stories on how the process is being conducted, the parties involved, the issues being considered, etc. This approach will help overcome the tendency of media to report mainly on the "tip-of-the-iceberg" news that surfaces in times of debate or crisis, and get them focussed on the details of developing the best possible education for the community's children.

- Contact school officials, parents groups, and others involved in the planning process regularly as a way of educating reporters on the complexities of planning, desegregation -- and, indeed, of elementary and secondary education in general. Most working reporters (and many editors and producers) know very little about education and the workings of school systems.

STAGE 3 - IMPLEMENTATION

Implementing the Desegregation Plan

A. Introduction

During the phases of the school desegregation process in which the primary focus is on determination of constitutional violation (Stage 1) or formulation of a desegregation plan (State 2), major activities are confined largely to deliberative legal and planning functions. Resolution of the legal questions at hand and formulation of desegregation plans will not directly involve most persons in the community or entail many activities in the schools. It is in the implementation phase that desegregation comes to have a direct impact on school operations, and it is at this stage that the determination is made whether school desegregation remains an unfulfilled prescription or becomes a reality.

The implementation of any school desegregation plan has two primary thrusts. One part is mainly logistical and relates to the operational changes which a school system must make to implement a desegregation plan. On this level, focus is on construction or alteration of physical facilities, transportation plans, changes in instructional materials, staff placement and other related activities. While such changes may be far-reaching and detailed, they are to a large extent technical and with the application of sufficient funding and expertise can be accomplished with reasonable speed and efficiency.

The other primary component is the process of winning community support through the active involvement of parents, other concerned citizens, and students in developing, implementing, and amending policies emerge from the desegregation process. While such a campaign should address itself in part to the ideal of achieving affirmative cooperation, it is essential that, at a minimum, all members of the community come to understand the necessity of responding to desegregation plans in a peaceful and orderly fashion. In this realm the problems are more complex, the process less predictable, and steps toward solution harder to achieve than at earlier stages.

There is no clear point at which people stop planning for desegregation and begin implementation. Plan implementation typically achieves public recognition when white and minority students start attending classes together or are bused to formerly "all-white" or "all-minority" schools. But in reality the implementation of a plan often begins earlier with less visible administrative actions such as staff workshops or changes in school budgets and tables of organization. Regardless of the type of plan or its timetable, the implementation of a desegregation plan creates some unique problems and opportunities for all the actors involved in the process.

B. Major Questions and Issues to be Resolved

The major questions to be answered during the implementation stage of the school desegregation process relate to whether the desegregation plan which has been devised and approved is being implemented fairly, effectively, and smoothly. If desegregation of the system's schools has been ordered by a court, the first and most basic question is whether school system operations are in compliance with the desegregation plan that the court has ordered.

In reviewing the major questions and issues which are likely to arise during the final stage of the desegregation process, it may prove helpful to divide them into four basic categories. Those categories relate to (1) achieving compliance, (2) working out the mechanics of plan operation, (3) winning community support and acceptance, and (4) resolving grievances and plan amendment.

Basic questions and issues in each of these categories include:

1. Achieving Plan Compliance

- Is the desegregation plan being implemented in line with the order of the court or school system directives?
- Are white and minority students integrated in all aspects of school programs?

2. Working out Plan Mechanics

- Have all the operational and logistical aspects of plan implementation been thoroughly worked out?
- Have school system personnel, parents, and students been informed of what changes to expect and prepared to deal with these changes and new situations?

- Has special attention been payed to working out technical details in such sensitive areas as transportation, emergency access to children, and safety and security?
- Has appropriate technical assistance been secured?

3. Winning Community Support and Acceptance

- Have efforts been made to inform all members of the community of their legal responsibilities related to school desegregation.
- Do community members understand that there is a connection between the stability and well-being of the community and the way the school desegregation issue is handled?

4. Resolving Grievances and Amending the Plan

- Are all students being treated fairly?
- Is there a mechanism for resolving disputes related to plan implementation and the treatment of students in the schools?
- Is there a mechanism for collecting information on plan operation and identifying weaknesses or problem areas?

C. Major Tasks to be Accomplished and Goals to be Achieved

In implementing a school desegregation plan, there are a number of major tasks to be accomplished and goals to be achieved which contribute to resolution of the questions and issues listed above. It may be most helpful to the reader to list them in the general order in which they must be addressed.

1. Assurance that there is a well organized, broadly-based leadership coalition established to stress the importance of taking positive action on behalf of peaceful school desegregation and assist in the resolution of problems which arise. Efforts to establish such a leadership coalition should begin early in the desegregation process, but it

is particularly vital that such a coalition be in place at the beginning of the implementation stage.

2. Establishment of an effective set of mechanisms which can quickly provide accurate, factual information on school operations and conditions to community members. The type of information needed at this stage will be different and narrower than at earlier stages. Rather than relating generally to an understanding of the desegregation process, it will focus sharply on the issue of what will happen to individual children as a result of the desegregation plan. These mechanisms must be able to alleviate fears and anxiety by providing answers to specific questions, and dealing factually with rumors and misinformation which emerge.

Previously established mechanisms for the collection and dissemination of information may be converted for use during the implementation state, or new mechanisms established. Specific tasks to be performed may include such things as establishment of telephone informational hot lines and rumor control centers, publication of newsletters and fact sheets, establishment of speakers bureaus, sponsorship of informational forums, and production of radio and television programs.

3. Effective school system planning to deal with the many mechanical and operational problems related to school desegregation.

4. Provision of training to school system personnel, students, and parents to equip them to deal with new situations.

5. Establishment of an effective monitoring commission.

6. Establishment of a set of grievance mechanisms for coping with problems which arise during the desegregation process. Grievance mechanisms should focus on settlement of disputes between community members and the school system, and on the treatment of students within the schools.

D. Primary Strategies for Resolution Appropriate to Stage 3

The School System

Strategies for Resolution in Stage 3 -- Implementation

In the implementation stage of the school desegregation process, many of the problems which the school system encounters relate to the operations of the schools. There are four primary strategies which the system can employ in attempting to come to grips with these problems. These strategies involving planning, training, communications, and establishment of grievance mechanisms.

1. Effective School System Planning

As noted in the introduction to this section on the implementation of desegregation plans, a major component of the implementation effort relates to logistical matters affecting school operations. Because of the great public sensitivity regarding certain logistical problems, their effective handling becomes crucial for maintaining the support and cooperation of the community.

Although these issues cannot be discussed in depth here, a few words of commentary are in order on the most critical concerns.

Transportation Plans. It is hardly necessary to observe that one of the aspects of school desegregation which encounters the most opposition is the transportation of students. When students are transported out of their neighborhoods to attend school, parents invariably become anxious over the effect on their children. When a desegregation plan involves transportation of students, it is important that every effort be made to see that the process goes smoothly. Areas of particular concern to parents related to student transportation include: 1) the safety of the children while being transported; 2) the necessity that the transportation be reliable and run according to schedule (students must be picked up, arrive at school, and return home when they are supposed to); 3 the establishment of transportation plans which do not significantly interfere with the students' ability to participate in school activities; and 4) the limitation of transportation times to a reasonable length. Incorporating these features into a transportation plan speaks directly to some of the deepest concerns that parents express regarding movement of their children within the school district.

Emergency Access to Children. When children are attending schools outside their immediate neighborhoods, parents voice concern about their access to the child -- and the child's access to home -- in the event of illness or injury. Many of these concerns can be allayed by the establishment of formalized procedures which are directed to the provision of emergency medical care and which provide for transporting students who become ill during the school day to their homes. The establishment of such procedures often can improve the level of care and treatment formerly available to students.

Safety and Security. The physical well-being of their children is perhaps the issue of paramount concern to parents. While it is unlikely that physical harm will come to a student in any school setting, school administrators must establish procedures which insure the safety and well-being of all students in the system. Confidence in the security of their children is something that every parent with children in the public schools has a right to expect. Parents are much more likely to be supportive of school operations which offer them that guarantee.

2. Initiation of Training Programs

As noted earlier, many of the actors in the desegregation process will find themselves faced with new situations and unfamiliar problems. Proper preparation and training can remove the anxiety of not knowing what to expect, and instill the confidence and security that stems from having the knowledge and ability needed to deal with a given situation.

In large part the responsibility for training is that of the school system, although other groups may want to supplement the school system's efforts -- particularly in the task of training persons in the community In most cities there are a multitude of technical assistance agencies and training resources that the school system can tap in its training efforts.

A sound training program should have a dual focus. Part of the thrust should be directed to the provision of human relations skills, information, and the development of an open attitude. But an equally important, and often overlooked, component of the training must focus on concrete problem-solving techniques that can be used to resolve specific problems which arise in desegregating schools.

Probably the best rule of thumb to use in deciding what persons or groups should be involved in training or other preparation is "the more the better." There are, however, a number of groups that must be included. Certainly all persons who are directly involved with public school operations -- administrators, teachers, staff, students and parents -- should go through a training program which equips them to deal with the process of desegregation. Parental involvement is especially important, and often there are numerous benefits to involving parents, particularly those whose children may be in new schools, in orientation and preparation programs. Such programs for parents usually have taken the form of orientation and exchange activities to familiarize parents with the neighborhood, staff, and facilities at the new school. While these programs have proven beneficial, even greater parental involvement can be achieved. Parents can also be used as consultants in designing training programs and formulating problem-solving techniques. Such input from parents can be of enormous benefit in helping administrators and teachers identify many types of problems which will arise during the school desegregation process and possible avenues for addressing them.

3. Facilitation of Communications

During the implementation stage of the desegregation process there will be intense public focus on activities in the schools. Parents groups, the media, and the courts (if court-ordered desegregation is involved) will be particularly interested in events in the schools related to desegregation.

The establishment of general mechanisms for information collection and dissemination is, as noted earlier, important to the implementation process. It also is important to note the critical role which the school system plays in facilitating the process of information exchange. School system administrators sit atop the school network and can, to a considerable extent, control the flow of information out of the school system. That position can be used to increase the flow and accuracy of information regarding school operations -- or to inhibit the information flow and distort the picture of what is going on in the schools.

Because the pressure to obtain information will be so great, and the tendency toward the generation of rumors and misinformation so strong, it is essential that the position of the school system be used to positively effect the information flow. Speedy and accurate response to problems and conditions in desegregating schools is vital to the intelligent treatment of those issues.

4. Establishment of Disciplinary and Grievance Mechanisms

No school desegregation process will be without its problems, and in even the most successful systems there are many grievances and complaints. An area that has proven particularly troublesome in desegregating school systems relates to student activities and student discipline. Students (who are extremely sensitive to the treatment they receive in any school -- and particularly a new one) and parents (who have a tremendous concern for the welfare of their children) will be keenly attuned to what happens to the students in a desegregating school. This atmosphere of watchfulness and tension creates an environment that is ripe for the generation of conflict. The only way to avoid the emergence of "incidents" is to see that problems or inequities which occur are resolved quickly and fairly. Additionally, there is a need for a process that allows rumors and exaggerations to be immediately identified -- and dealt with by providing immediate factual information through a credible source.

The two devices which best serve these ends are the establishment of equitable and well-publicized policies regarding student conduct and discipline, and the development of grievance procedures for resolution of disputes which arise related to school operations.

In any area of student behavior where disputes are likely to arise over what is or is not appropriate conduct -- and what constitutes fair and reasonable discipline -- written policies and procedures are indispensible. If all parties are aware of what is expected, and understand the sanctions which will be imposed for not complying with those expectations, the likelihood of disputes arising over what behavior is acceptable and what disciplinary measures are appropriate is greatly reduced. It is, of course, incumbent on administrators and teachers to make every effort to see that those policies and procedures are implemented objectively.

In those instances in which disputes do occur and grievances arise, there is a need to have a mechanism to resolve them quickly and equitably. Established procedures for the resolution of grievances which extend representation to all involved parties, are regarded as fair, and are understood by everyone are a necessity. Provision of an effective, equitable, and widely recognized device for resolving disputes and grievances within the school system reduces the chances that problems will escalate and necessitate intervention from outside the school system.*

Finally, while the use of grievance procedures is usually seen as related to internal school operations -- particularly for the resolution of matters involving students -- there is considerable merit to establishing community-oriented grievance procedures which can address complaints that citizens may have against the school system. The orderly, speedy and constructive resolution of parents' grievances is especially important during the desegregation process.

For a detailed description of the process and problems involved in setting up school grievance procedures, see 'Is That Really Fair?' Comments and Responses on the Needs, Purpose, Status, and Functions of Student Grievance Procedures in Public Education, William Lincoln and Sandra L. Enos (eds.), Washington: National Institute of Education, 1978.

Parents and Students

Strategies for Resolution in Stage 3 — Implementation

The strategies available to parents and students during the implementation stage of the school desegregation process are dependent to a large extent on their ability to expand the role they plan in school system operations and decision-making. A frequent outcome of the desegregation process is that there is some expansion of the role which parents and students play in school system policy formulation. This is particularly true in matters directly related to the desegregation issue.

There are several specific strategies available to parents and students that maximize their ability to monitor the implementation process and affect its outcome. They include:

- Service on official monitoring commissions.
- Systematic collection of information and reporting of activities within the school system related to the desegregation process.
- Use of established grievance mechanisms -- and specific attempts to improve such procedures.
- Service on leadership bodies dealing with information dissemination and orderly implementation.
- Communication of problems and concerns to the school system, court, or other bodies overseeing the implementation process.
- Involvement on existing advisory committees -- such as those associated with Elementary and Secondary Education Act (Title I) and Emergency School Aid Act programs.

Perhaps the most important activity in which parents and students can be involved at this stage in the desegregation process is participation on an official monitoring commission. This manual advocates the establishment of a broad-based monitoring commission with a formal mandate from the court (if a court-ordered plan is involved) and strong political and monetary support from the community's leaders (whether or not a court order is involved). As the persons most directly affected by school desegregation, students and their parents have the most stake in implementation and the ultimate say on consumer satisfaction. They need to be heavily involved in identifying problems at the level of the individual school and proposing solutions to the monitoring body and the school system. Parents should seek whatever help they feel they need from various technical assistance groups to increase the effectiveness of their participation on monitoring commissions.*

---

*For a thorough discussion of the prospects and problems of monitoring groups, see Viewpoints and Guidelines on Court Appointed Monitoring Commissions in School Desegregation by Lila Carol. Report of a Symposium sponsored by the Community Relations Service of the U.S. Department of Justice and the College of Education, Ohio State University, 1977.

Community Leadership

Strategies for Resolution in Stage 3 -- Implementation

The establishment of a broadly-based leadership coalition which can stress the importance of taking positive action on behalf of peaceful school desegregation is critical to successful implementation of any desegregation plan. Such a coalition can play a major role in establishing a feeling within the community that compliance with the law and promotion of the community's welfare will be the standards for behavior that prevail -- and that unlawful, disruptive, and divisive activities will not be encouraged or tolerated. This coalition also can be instrumental in assisting in the establishment of the many problem-solving mechanisms which facilitate successful implementation.

Specific strategies to be employed by a broadly representative leadership coalition include:

1. Issuance of a public statement early in the implementation process reaffirming the coalition's support for fair, orderly, and peaceful behavior. Such a statement provides a rallying point for the majority of citizens who will approach implementation in this manner, and it reaffirms the community's commitment to compliance with the law.

2. Establishment of a mechanism for information dissemination that can provide quick and accurate responses to specific questions. In addition to the broad general information that is needed in the earlier stages of the desegregation process, there is a need during implementation for a mechanism which can provide answers to specific individual questions as well as dispel rumors. Many of the actors in the desegregation process -- particularly parents with children in the public school system -- will have little interest in school desegregation as a general policy issue. Their interest and orientation will be specific and intense, focusing on the

question of "What will happen to my child?" If the fears of these parents are to be allayed, they will have to be given direct and honest responses to their questions. In those instances in which the specific information they desire is not immediately available, they must be informed when the information will be forthcoming and the process through which it will emerge.

There is a need for an informational mechanism which can stop rumors and correct misinformation which gains currency. When persons are operating under stressful circumstances, misinformation has a way of emerging and taking hold of emotions, often triggering hasty responses in a wide array of situations. Rumors threaten constructive problem-solving, and must be checked the moment they begin to arise.

The formulas for keeping the public informed during the desegregation process are fairly precise. While there is a need to tailor the specific nature and use of each of the following components to the needs of the individual community, the strategic value of each has been proven in desegregating school districts. A leadership coalition can be particularly effective in insuring that these strategies are employed.

- The local media must be encouraged and equipped to provide comprehensive and balanced coverage of the desegregation process.

In many communities members of the leadership coalitions have met with representatives of the media -- including management and editorial staffs as well as the working press -- to discuss the importance of this media role. Technical assistance is available through the federal Community Relations Service and other agencies to prepare the media for the issues which will arise in covering school desegregation. Above all, it is necessary that the media be impressed with the need for balanced, impartial coverage and the necessity of avoiding exploitation of the desegregation issue.

- The school system must be encouraged to be candid and forthcoming with information related to the desegregation process

In many communities there is considerable feeling that the school system does not really want to keep citizens fully informed. In the sometimes emotionally charged environment created by desegregation, it is particularly important for that suspicion to be discussed openly and the truth discovered. Proper training of the school system's public information staff can go a long way toward achievement of that goal.

- An independent body, preferably a broadly based citizens or community group, should be delegated responsibility for facilitating information dissemination.

The more representative this group is the greater will be its credibility, and it should be able to overcome much of the wariness that greets information which comes directly from the parties in the case. A wide array of techniques for disseminating information is available to such a group, including:

-- Establishment of informational telephone hot lines and rumor control centers.

-- Publication of newsletters and fact sheets.

-- Establishment of a speakers bureau.

-- Sponsorship of informational forums.

-- Production or sponsorship of radio and television programs.

3. Provision of Technical Assistance. The importance of good technical assistance in the desegregation process already has been discussed. In some instances the school system itself is able to provide the technical assistance needed. In other cases the schools lack the necessary resources -- or political considerations dicate that services come from outside the school

system. A coalition of community leaders can perform an important role in insuring that needed technical assistance is provided and that it meets the requirements of the implementation process.

It is not always easy to obtain quality staff personnel for the ad hoc operations which are set up to facilitate desegregation. The short-term notice of need and the brief duration of these operations contribute to this staffing problem. One strategy available to overcome this problem is the possibility of "borrowing" professionals from organizations within the community. Business and labor groups, service agencies, and educational and governmental institutions have control over a vast store of highly trained and experienced personnel. In many communities these groups have been willing to make staff available to assist in desegregation, either by granting them leaves of absence or retaining them as employees and detailing them to groups involved in the desegregation effort.

Many of the community-based efforts which are undertaken to assist in the implementation process find that the first issue they face is that of securing a source of financial support. Because these operations are often large in scale and take place outside the regular patterns of governmental, charitable, and foundation fund allocation, their financial needs have proven difficult to fill.

Private foundations and civic organizations have provided the most common source of financial support for these operations, although on occasion direct fund-raising or membership drives have been undertaken.

Historically little federal educational money has been forthcoming to support this type of assistance, but recent Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA) guidelines do make some funds available for the first time. There also has been an increase in the financial support for implementation activities coming from state boards of education. On occasion the financial support of the state's educational agency has been voluntary; more frequently it has come by court order. These funding constraints necessitate that the search for financial support be undertaken early in the process.

Enforcement Agencies

Strategies for Resolution in Stage 3 -- Implementation

The primary role of enforcement agencies in the implementation stage is to insure that the plan which has been developed by the school system or ordered by the court is implemented fully and effectively. It is the agency that has made the decision to desegregate -- the court or the school system -- that will assume primary responsibility for insuring that the provisions of the plans are carried out.

Therefore, if a court-ordered plan is involved, the court which issued the order (either for a specific plan or for a mandated process for plan-formulation) is the major formal enforcement agency which operates during this stage. The other enforcement agencies may be involved in some of the following ways:

State Educational Agencies. Provision of money and technical assistance to the school system and to other parties, often keyed to compliance with standards relating to desegregation and citizen participation.

Federal Educational and Civil Rights Agencies. The Office of Civil Rights in HEW, the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, the Civil Rights Division of the U.S. Department of Justice -- all have been involved in the implementation phase of school desegregation in a number of communities. The Office of Civil Rights monitors compliance for HEW. The U.S. Commission Civil Rights holds hearings and issues investigative reports on civil rights matters related to education. The Civil Rights Division of the Justice Department may retain jurisdiction for some time after a court order is issued, for the purpose of monitoring compliance.

Police and Other Law Enforcement Agencies. Law enforcement officials have been an integral part of the planning for implementation at the school building level. They have the formal power to maintain civil order, and they can intervene on their own initiative if disruptions accompany school desegregation. The aim of school officials, students, and parents should be to maintain the proper climate in each school -- and thus maintain the control and integrity of their own building without outside enforcement officials.

The primary focus of this section, however, is on enforcement and the implementation of the plan developed in Stage 2. Since the typical pattern has been the ordering of desegregation plans by the courts, this section outlines the process of monitoring and the development of monitoring devices -- which involves a broad spectrum of community leadership, as well as enforcement agencies.

The mechanism which has been used most frequently to perform the function of ensuring that the plan is implemented is the monitoring commission. A large number of desegregating school districts use this device, and a well-developed set of strategies has emerged for the structuring and operation of a monitoring commission.

While the exact powers, function, and structure of a monitoring body may vary from city to city, there are similarities which are shared by almost all such commissions. Those characteristics should be kept in mind in forming a monitoring commission in any city.

The most common type of monitoring body in school systems which are operating under a court-ordered plan are those which have been established by the court. In their most elemental form, these monitoring bodies collect and analyze information relating to the operation of the schools and report that information to the court so a determination of compliance with the desegregation plan can be made. The powers and functions of the monitoring commission can also be much broader in nature, and include responsibility for such tasks as information dissemination, conflict resolution, and coordination of the activities of all the community groups involved in the desegregation issue.

In any city in which a monitoring body is established, local conditions and needs will shape the powers and functions which are delegated to that body. Regardless, however, of the nature and extent of the monitoring commission's role (a determination which is usually made by the court), there is one especially important criterion which must be met if there is to be any hope of effectiveness: the commission be given a clear and precise definition of the functions it is to perform. Unless it begins from such a base, it will prove almost impossible for the commission to overcome all of the technical and political difficulties it will face.

A frequent complaint heard from local parties in school desegregation cases relates to what is viewed as a lack of local control over the process. The charge is often leveled that outside agencies, particularly federal courts and the federal educational establishment, have infringed unduly on the operation of local schools. An effective, representative, and responsive monitoring body can serve to return a good portion of control to the local community. It is in the interest, then, of every group concerned about local control of the schools to support establishment of a strong monitoring commission.

Enumerated below are some of the considerations which should be taken into account in establishing a monitoring commission.

Structure of the Monitoring Commission.

A wide variety of models are available for the form which the structure of the monitoring body takes, but there are two characteristics which appear important in assuring the success of the monitoring effort:

- The monitoring body must be representative. It is essential that persons from all groups within the community be included on the commission. It is of critical importance that parents and representatives of the groups who are the plaintiffs in the case serve as the nucleus of the commission. A representative body will profit from the divergence of the views it accommodates and enjoy greater credibility in the community.

- The monitoring commission will almost invariably benefit from having at least a small professional staff. A good portion of the commission's work will be technical and necessitate the performance of such time-consuming tasks as data-analysis, comparative research, writing, and report preparation. It is difficult, often impossible, to execute these functions with part-time citizen personnel.

Information Collection and Analysis.

The backbone of most monitoring operations is the process of information collection and analysis. Possession of pertinent and accurate information provides the only sound basis from which decisions relating to school desegregation can be made. In this regard two primary needs emerge:

- There is a need to provide adequate training to all persons connected with the monitoring function. Both volunteers and professional staff need to be schooled in what to look for -- and how to look -- when examining school operations to detect problems and assess the quality of education which is being offered.

- Clear procedures must be worked out to coordinate the monitoring function with school operations. While it is necessary for monitoring bodies to have full and easy access to the schools, it is also important that interference with school operations at the building level be held to a minimum.

Reporting.

Once the monitoring commission has collected, analyzed, and compiled the pertinent data in report form, it is necessary that the information be effectively conveyed to the Court, the schools, and the general community. Several things are necessary to facilitate this interchange:

- The monitoring body should have access to the judge. Judicial access is essential in the conveyance of periodic formal reports, but also in the on-going operations of the commission.
- Reports should be prepared in clear and direct language, and should contain specific recommendations. The recommendations should be written with an understanding that broad community acceptance is crucial.
- Information generated by the monitoring body should be shared fully with the school system and the community. Action in response to conditions which exist in the schools and the community can only come when persons are aware of those conditions.

Relationship of the Monitoring Commission with the Community.

1. Relationships with Parents and Parent Groups.

An increasing point of sensitivity among parents with children in the public schools relates to the accountability of the school system and the degree of control which parents have over educational decisions affecting their children. The educational issues which surround school desegregation have historically proven to be of particular concern to all parents, both black and white. If parents are to feel comfortable with the monitoring body which is watching over the desegregation process, they must feel that they have substantive input and a fair share of control of the body's operations.

2. Relationship with the School System.

The existence and operations of the monitoring body often are quite threatening to the school system. Board members, administrators, faculty, and staff generally regard themselves as hard-working, well-motivated professionals whose business is the operation of the schools. School personnel cannot be expected to be completely enthused about the monitoring process, which almost unavoidably leaves school personnel with the uncomfortable feeling that someone is looking over their shoulders as they carry out their work.

The monitoring group must make every effort not to interfere in the operations of the schools, or give the impression that it is trying to run the school system.

Just as importantly, the commission should strive to frame its findings and recommendations as constructively and viably as possible so the school system is encouraged to cooperate rather than being threatened by criticism and made defensive about making operational adjustments.

3. Establishment of Credibility with the Minority Community.

Members of the minority community frequently are conditioned by their previous experiences to expect officially constituted bodies not to be responsive to their needs. For the monitoring commission to maintain credibility in the minority community -- particularly if the commission is reporting that "all is well" in the schools -- every effort will have to be made to demonstrate its objectivity and fairness. Inclusion of strong minority representation is an important step toward winning this credibility.

4. Establishment of Credibility with Opponents of Desegregation.

Many persons who are opponents of school desegregation are apt to regard the whole process as one which is inimical to their interests. Such groups are likely to view monitoring, or any other desegregation-related activity, as simply an additional instance in which their needs are being sacrificed to the needs of another group. If the monitoring body hopes to win the cooperation of these groups, it will have to demonstrate its desire and ability to act equitably. A strong effort must be made to distinguish real problems and incidents from imagined ones, and to deal factually and fairly with the legitimate needs of opponents of desegregation.

5. Clarification of Relationships with other Community Groups.

Almost invariably, a wide array of community groups become involved in the desegregation issue. If the monitoring body is to avoid the difficulties which arise from unclear role definition, and the attendant political in-fighting, an affirmative effort will have to be made to clarify the relationship of the monitoring commission to these other groups.

* * *

In summary, fair and effective implementation requires monitoring, in which enforcement agencies and a broad range of community groups must be involved. If such monitoring does not occur, all the planning and hard work of previous stages may never come to full and satisfactory fruition.

Other Interest Groups

Strategies for Resolution in Stage 3 -- Implementation

Two of the other interest groups identified -- technical assistants and media -- have especially important roles to play during the implementation stage. The roles of the other two groups included in this category -- pro- and anti-desegregation groups -- are less clearly defined. A word on these latter two groups is in order first.

Pro-Desegregation Groups. Most pro-desegregation groups have been vitally concerned with the quality of education in the public schools. In fact, the impetus behind a desegregation suit or other challenges often is the belief that segregated education has not adequately served the needs of minority children. So, many of these organizations have developed a special focus on -- and materials for the promotion of -- quality education. It is during the implementation stage that the translation of the hope of quality desegregation education into a reality can take place. The NAACP (local and national) and other organizations supporting desegregation must continue to be actively involved in monitoring implementation and, where appropriate, assisting in the schools.

Anti-Desegregation Groups. If resistance persists among anti-desegregation groups, the education of the children may be adversely affected. Such groups should be encouraged to place the needs of the children first, and to become involved in the monitoring or other bodies charged with the responsibility for overseeing implementation. Often their interests are similar to those of the pro-desegregation groups which may have brought the issue to the surface initially: high quality education for children. If persons who had been active in anti-desegregation efforts can become deeply involved in implementation, they will be better able both to advocate their own interests in a constructive forum and to affect policy within the schools (a task they cannot hope to accomplish if they continue to be identified with groups resisting a desegregation plan established by the courts and/or the school system and backed with broad community support).

* * *

Technical assistants and the media should play more central and specific roles in the Implementation stage. Some suggested roles and strategies are outlined below.

Technical Assistants. One of the greatest needs in this stage is for skilled technicians in the areas of budgeting, training, data-gathering, personnel management, problem evaluation, site management, and other fields. Often the school system does not have sufficient personnel to meet the complex requirements of implementing changes in the system. Management and public relations firms, architectural firms, universities, consulting firms, research centers, and various social services agencies all can assist in the Implementation stage by making such technical services available -- to the school system, to the monitoring commission or committee, and to other interested parties who want to learn more about the schools and get more involved in their operation.

These technical assistant groups can be extremely helpful in another way at this stage. The personnel in these kinds of organizations usually are linked to similar persons and organizations in other cities and states, and can draw on these connections for comparative information, direct assistance, and, on occasion, financial assistance. An example is the local academic who has conducted projects for large foundations which fund education programs (the Ford Foundation in New York, for example), and can serve as an advocate to his or her contacts at the foundation for requests for support that come from the local schools or monitoring commission.

Another strategy which technical assistants should consider is the drawing together of their local and national networks into an advisory panel that can serve the school system and monitoring commission during implementation. Such a group can serve as an important source of assistance and encouragement in achieving plan compliance, as well as an important source of advice and potential funds.

Media. Because the media can cause a number of problems that sometimes are associated with implementation -- or make existing problems worse -- very close attention should be paid to their role during this stage. Participants in the desegregation process may be surprised to find media representatives who were highly visible during the Decision stage, but dormant during the more technical planning stage, surfacing again when desegregation plans are implemented. Again the "iceberg" approach to news coverage tends to emerge: short-term surface coverage of conflict and crisis events rather than long-term in-depth coverage of the entire situation.

Media leaders should be encouraged to meet early and often to develop a plan for responsible coverage of desegregation implementation -- and not follow the "send the cameras on the first day to see if there is a racial incident" approach. Reporters, producers, and editors should receive training from agencies such as the Community Relations Service in media coverage during implementation. Technicians should receive training, too; the placement -- or even the presence -- of television equipment can bear a direct relationship to the behavior of the students and teachers present.

Only if there is early and regular consultation between the owners and top managers of media during this stage (and all stages) of the desegregation process will communities be able to avoid the crisis-reporting so typical of the news media. News managers must develop trust between one another, and with the parties with whom they have to work, if they are to get beyond the fear of being "scooped" that plays such a large role in determining the type of coverage they employ.

Community leaders at all levels must work with the media to assure them that non-inflammatory coverage is the responsible position to take -- and that such coverage is consistent with the First Amendment rights so vital to all the parties involved in and affected by the school desegregation process in America.

PART III. WHERE TO GET HELP: SOURCES OF ASSISTANCE IN RESOLVING ISSUES RELATED TO SCHOOL DESEGREGATION

Part III

WHERE TO GET HELP

Sources of Assistance in Resolving Issues Related to School Desegregation

In this final section of the handbook, two brief lists of sources are offered to which persons and groups in the community may turn in seeking additional help and information about dealing with issues related to the desegregation process. One list focuses on agencies and organizations working in the area of school desegregation that can offer local groups assistance and services. The other list focuses on written materials -- especially handbooks and pamphlets -- that provide additional information on specific aspects of the desegregation question.

In both instances an attempt has been made to limit the length of the list. This is particularly true of the written resource materials, which have been selected from among the thousands of books, articles, reports, pamphlets, etc., that have been written on school desegregation since the 1954 Supreme Court decision in Brown vs. Board of Education. Resource materials listed here were selected on the following bases: (a) they deal with major issues or problems which were covered in this handbook, (b) they are addressed specifically to groups in the community, rather than to social scientists or scholars, and (c) most are relatively short in length.

Similar standards were used in compiling a list of organizations and agencies that can provide assistance and services to local groups. This list is confined to organizations with (a) a history of dealing directly with community groups on issues related to school desegregation and (b) a sufficient staff and range of resources to respond to requests for information or assistance.

A. AGENCIES AND ORGANIZATIONS

Public Agencies:

- Community Relations Service, U.S. Department of Justice, 550 11th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20530, (202) 739-4045.

The Community Relations Service is an impartial U. S. Department of Justice agency which was established to conciliate and mediate disputes between community and racial groups. In many instances, CRS can make referrals to local organizations and coalitions that are involved in the school desegregation issue. In addition to its headquarters in Washington, D.C., CRS has 10 regional offices:

ATLANTA 30303
Room 900
75 Piedmont Avenue, N.E.
(404) 526-6883

BOSTON 02114
Room 1304
150 Causeway Street
(617) 223-5170

CHICAGO 60603
Room 1440
55 East Monroe Street
(312) 353-4391

DALLAS 75202
Room 13B-35
Federal Building
1100 Commerce Street
(214) 749-2457

DENVER 80202
4th Floor
1531 Stout Street
(303) 837-2973

KANSAS CITY, MISSOURI 64106
Room 121
911 Walnut Street
(816) 374-2022

NEW YORK 10007
Room 3400
U.S. Customs and Court House
26 Federal Plaza
(212) 264-0700

PHILADELPHIA 19106
Room 309
U.S. Customs House
2nd and Chestnut Streets
(215) 597-2344

SAN FRANCISCO 94105
Room 703
100 Mission Street
(415) 556-2485

SEATTLE 98105
Room 1898
1915 Second Avenue
(206) 442-4465

- Desegregation Studies Unit, National Institute of Education, 1200 19th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20208, (202) 254-6271.

  The Desegregation Studies Unit of NIE sponsors and supports a variety of research related to desegregation of the nation's schools. Many manuals, reports, and pamphlets are available through this Unit of NIE.

- ESAA Program Managers, U.S. Office of Education, Equal Educational Opportunity, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

  The Bureau of School Systems within the Office of Education assists local school districts with problems related to school desegregation. Much of this assistance is provided through technical assistance funds made available through the Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA). A wide range of non-profit private agencies, institutions, and organizations may make application for ESAA funds for programs that will facilitate the implementation of school desegregation plans. Information on the availability of ESAA funds and programs can be obtained through the ESAA Program Manager at each of the regional offices:

Region I:
Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Vermont:
John Fitzgerald Kennedy Federal Building
Government Center
Boston, MA 02203

Region II:
New York, New Jersey, Puerto Rico and Virgin Islands:
Federal Building
26 Federal Plaza
New York, NY 10007

Region III:
Delaware, District of Columbia, Maryland, Pennsylvania, Virginia and West Virginia:
P.O. Box 13716
Philadelphia, PA 19101

Region IV:
Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Tennessee:
50 7th Street, N.E.
Atlanta, GA 30323

Region V:
Illinois, Indiana, Minnesota, Michigan, Ohio and Wisconsin:
300 South Wacker Drive
Chicago, IL 60606

Region VI:
Arkansas, Louisiana, New Mexico, Oklahoma, and Texas:
1114 Commerce Street
Dallas, TX 75202

Region VII:
Iowa, Kansas, Missouri and Nebraska:
New Federal Office Building
601 East 12th Street
Kansas City, MO 64106

Region VIII:
Colorado, Montana, North Dakota,
South Dakota, Utah, and Wyoming
1961 Stout Street
Denver, CO 80203

Region IX:
Arizona, California, Hawaii and
Nevada:
50 Fulton Street, Room 359
San Francisco, CA 94102

Region X:
Alaska, Idaho, Oregon and Washington:
Arcade Plaza Building--M/S 1509
1321 Second Avenue
Seattle, WA 98101

- Ethnic Heritage Studies Unit, U.S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C. 20202, (202) 655-4000.

  Information on multi-cultural, ethnic, and racial education is available through this division of the U.S. Office of Education.

- The United States Commission on Civil Rights, 1121 Vermont Avenue, NW, Washington, D.C. 20425, (202) 254-6697

  A wide variety of reports on the school desegregation issue are available from the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights -- a fact-finding agency established by Congress under the civil Rights Act of 1957.

  In addition to the Washington, D.C. headquarters, there are eight regional offices:

Northeastern Regional Office
U.S. Commission on Civil Rights
26 Federal Plaza, Room 1639
New York, NY 10007
(212) 264-0400

Southern Regional Office
U.S. Commission on Civil Rights
Citizens Trust Bank Building
75 Piedmont Ave., NE, Room 362
Atlanta, GA 30303
(404) 526-4391

Mid-Atlantic Regional Office
U.S. Commission on Civil Rights
2120 L Street NW, Room 510
Washington, D.C. 20425
(202) 254-6717

Midwestern Regional Office
U.S. Commission on Civil Rights
219 S. Dearborn St., Room 1428
Chicago, IL 60604
(312) 353-7371

Central States Regional Office
U.S. Commission on Civil Rights
Old Federal Office Building
911 Walnut Street, Room 3103
Kansas City, MO 64106
(816) 374-5253

Southwestern Regional Office
U.S. Commission on Civil Rights
New Moore Building
106 Broadway, Room 249
San Antonio, TX 78205
(512) 225-4764

Mountain States Regional Office
U.S. Commission on Civil Rights
Ross Building
1726 Champa Street, Room 216
Denver, CO 80202
(303) 837-2211

Western Regional Office
U.S. Commission on Civil Rights
312 North Sprint St., Room 1015
Los Angeles, CA 90012
(213) 688-3437

Private Organizations:

- American Federation of Teachers, Human Rights and Community Relations, 11 DuPont Circle, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036, (202) 797-4400.

- Center for Community Justice, 918 16th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20006, (202) 296-2565.

  The Center for Community Justice has been working for nearly a decade to develop procedures for resolving grievances in institutions and agencies -- including schools. The CCJ can advise groups in a school district on how to set up student and community grievance procedures and, in a limited number of settings, give direct assistance in their establishment.

- Citizens' Council for Ohio Schools, 517 The Arcade, Cleveland, Ohio 44114, (206) 621-5520.

  Ohio is the state that has had the greatest concentration of desegregation litigation. The Citizens' Council for Ohio Schools has been an especially active and effective citizens' group working in the area of school desegregation. The Council has produced a number of excellent handbooks on various aspects of the school desegregation process.

- Home and School Institute, Inc., Box 4847, Washington, D.C. 20008, (202) 362-9066. The HSI is an organization dedicated to expending the role which parents play in the schools and the education of their children. Several programs and publications are available through the Institute.

- National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 1790 Broadway, New York, New York 10019, (212) 245-2100.

  The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People is engaged in lobbying for civil rights legislation, voter registration and a variety of direct action programs. There are more than 1,800 local units and seven regional offices. The NAACP Legal Defense Fund has supported a wide array of civil rights litigation including many cases directed toward school desegregation.

- National Center for Quality Integrated Education, 1201 16th Street, NW, Room 403, Washington, D.C.

  The National Center for Quality Integrated Education is a project operated by the National Conference of Christians and Jews and funded by the Ford Foundation. The Center works to establish cooperation between national, state, and local organizations to achieve quality integrated education.

- National Committee for Citizens in Education, Suite 410, Wilde Lake Village Green, Columbia, Maryland 21044, (301) 997-9300.

  The National Committee for Citizens in Education is a non-profit organization dedicated to increasing citizen involvement in the affairs of the nation's public schools. The Committee has sponsored conferences on parental involvement in public education, initiated litigation, undertaken organizational activities among parents groups, and published a number of reports and handbooks on parental involvement in the schools, including Network, a newspaper for parents about schools.

- The National Congress of Parents and Teachers (National P.T.A.), 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Illinois 60611, (312) 787-0977.

  The National P.T.A. is an organization which works with the schools to provide quality education for all children and youth, and which endeavors to involve parents in the decision making processes establishing school policies.

- National Conference of Christians and Jews, J. Oscar Lee, Senior Education Consultant, 43 West 57th Street, New York, New York 10019, (212) 688-7530.

- National Education Association, R. Boyd Bosma, Civil And Human Rights, 1201 16th Street, NW, Washington, D.C. 20036, (202) 833-4000.

- National Education Task Force de la Raza, Tomas Villarreal, Jr., College of Education, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, New Mexico 87131, (505) 277-2231.

- National Project and Task Force on Desegregation Strategies, Education Commission of the States, 1860 Lincoln Street, Suite 300, Denver, Colorado 80295, (303) 861-4917.

  The National Task Force on Desegregation Strategies was established under the sponsorship of the Education Commission of the States, the National Association of State Boards of Education, and the Council of Chief State School officers. The Task Force is a racially and ethnically diverse group of state and local educational officials, community and religious leaders, and scholars, all of whom have extensive experience with school desegregation. The aim of the project and the task force is to stimulate interest at the state level in school desegregation, and to help states find ways to exercise effective leadership in promoting equal educational opportunity.

- National Urban League, Carol Gibson, Director of Education, 500 East 62nd Street, New York, New York 10021, (212) 644-6500.

  The National Urban League is a professional community service organization committed to securing equal opportunities for minorities in all areas of American life. It is nonpartisan and interracial in its leadership and staff. The League has affiliates in nearly 100 cities, and five regional offices.

B. RESOURCE MATERIALS

Legal Aspects of School Desegregation:

- A Citizen's Guide to School Desegregation Law, National Institute of Education, July 1978 (available from NIE, 1200 19th Street, NW, Washington, D.C. 20208).

Community Involvement and Preparation for School Desegregation:

- Citizens Guide to Desegregation, A Report of the Citizens' Council for Ohio Schools, February 1976 (available at a cost of $1.25 for single copies and $1.00 each for orders of 25 or more from Citizens' Council for Ohio Schools, 517 the Arcade, Cleveland, Ohio 44114).

- Desegregation Without Turmoil: The Role of the Multi-Racial Community Coalition in Preparing for Smooth Transition, National Conference of Christians and Jews, 1976 (available from the National Conference of Christians and Jews, 43 West 57th Street, New York, New York).

- The Role of the Community in the School Desegregation/Integration Process, National Center for Quality Integrated Education and Ministries in Public Education, June 1977 (available at a cost of $2.00 per copy for single copies and $1.50 each plus postage and handling for orders of 10 or more from the National Center for Quality Integrated Education, 1201 16th Street, NW, Room 403, Washington, D.C. 20036 or Ministries in Public Education, 40 Educational Ministries - ABC, Valley Forge, Pennsylvania 19481).

- Good Things Can Happen: Your Community Organization and School Desegregation, Bill Burgess, Federation of Community Planning (available from the Federation of Community Planning, 1001 Huron Road, Cleveland, Ohio 44115).

- NAACP Report on Quality Education for Black Americans, NAACP Special Contribution Fund, September 1977, National Office NAACP, 1970 Broadway, New York, New York 10019.

- School Desegregation: Community Preparation and the Role of the Churches, Division of Education and Ministry, National Council of Churches of Christ, February 1977 (available from the National Council of Churches of Christ in the U.S.A., 475 Riverside Drive, New York, New York 10027).

- Take A Giant Step: Recommendations of a National Conference on Successful Desegregation, National School Public Relations Association, December 1976 (available from the National School Public Relations Association, 1801 N. Moore, Arlington, Virginia 22209.

- The Role of the Business Community in Preparing for Peaceful Implementation of School Desegregation Plans, Donald Gearhart, Rene Martinez, and William O'Brien, (workshop presentation, mimeo paper) May 1976 (available from the U.S. Community Relations Service, 550 11th Street, NW, Washington, D.C. 20530).

- Achieving Effective Desegregation, Al Smith, Anthony Downs, M. Leanne Lachman, Lexington Books, 1973 (available from D.C. Heath and Company, Lexington, Massachusetts 02173).

Metropolitan School Desegregation:

- Exploring Metropolitan Ways Toward Reducing Racial Isolation: Prospects for Progress, Forbes Bottomly and Allison Kitfield, Education Commission of the States, January 1978 (available from Education Commission of the States, 300 Lincoln Tower, 1860 Lincoln Street, Denver, Colorado 80295).

Training for School Desegregation:

- Desegregation In-Service Training: A Resource Packet for Education Association Leaders, Boyd R. Bcsma and Carl Jones, 1976 (available from the National Education Association, 1201 16th Street, NW, Washington, D.C. 20036).

- Desegregation/Integration Planning for Social Change: A Training Program for Intergroup Educators, Marc Chesler, Alan Guskin, David Sanchez, Mort Soewitz, Will Smith. Sociology Dept., U. of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI

- Programs for Training Citizen Leaders, Patricia Rich and Agnes Garino, Citizens Information/Resource Center, 1979 (available at a cost of $7.00 plus $1.50 for postage and handling from the Citizens Information/Resource Center, League of Women Voters of Metropolitan St. Louis, 2138 Woodson Road, St. Louis, Missouri 63114).

Human Relations:

- Racism in America and How to Combat It, United States Commission on Civil Rights, Clearinghouse Publication, Urban Series, No. 1, January 1970 (available from the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, 50 cents).

- Human Relations in School Settings, Chester W. Oden and Scott W. McDonald, National Council on Crime and Delinquency, February 1978 (available at a cost of $2.06 from ERIC Document Preproduction Service, P.O. Box 190, Arlington, Virginia 22210, specify order no. ED 157 194).

School Operations and Administration:

- A Handbook for Integrated Schooling, Garlie A. Forehand and Marjorie Ragosta, Educational Testing Service, July 1976 (available from the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, Washington, D.C. 20202).

- The Role of the School Principal in School Desegregation, National Institute of Education, 1978 (available from the National Institute of Education, Desegregation Studies Unit, 1200 19th Street, NW, Washington, D.C. 20208).

- "How to Make Desegregation Work: The Adaption of Schools to Their Newly-Integrated Student Bodies", Gary Orfield, in The Courts, Social Science and School Desegregation - Part II, Law and Contemporary Problems, Spring 1975, Duke University School of Law, Durham, NC 27706 (also available from Orfield, Department of Political Science, University of Illinois, Urbana, IL 61801).

- School Desegregation Guidelines for Local and State Education Association, National Education Association, February 1974 (available from the National Education Association, 1201 16th Street, NW, Washington, D.C. 20036).

- Justice Delayed and Denied: HEW and Northern School Desegregation, Center for National Policy Review, September 1974 (available at a cost of $1.00 from the Center for National Policy Review, School of Law, Catholic University of America, Washington, D.C. 20064).

- "What Research and Experience Teach Us About Desegregating Large Northern Cities", Ronald Henderson and Mary Von Euler, Clearinghouse for Civil Rights Research, Volume VII, No. 1, Spring 1979 (available from the Center for National Policy Review, Catholic University School of Law, Washington, D.C. 20064).

- Guidelines for Public School Communications, Pennsylvania Department of Education, 1971 (available from the Pennsylvania Department of Education, Harrisburg, PA 17126).

Curriculum and Instruction:

- Multi-Ethnic Curriculum, Natalie Robbins, Columbia University, General Assistance Center for Equal Educational Opportunity, 1977 (available at a cost of $2.15 from ERIC Document Reproduction Service, P.O. Box 190, Arlington, Virginia 22210).

- Evaluation Guidelines for Multicultural/Multiracial Education (designed primarily for secondary schools), National Study of School Evaluation, 1973 (available from the National Study of School Evaluation, 2201 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, Virginia 22201).

- "Coming of Age in Bilingual/Bicultural Education: A Historical Perspective", Josue M. Gonzales, in Inequality in Education, No. 19:75, February 1975, pp. 5-17.

Student Needs and Rights:

- The Rights of Students, Alan H. Levine and Eve Cary, American Civil Liberties Union, 1973 (available from Avon Books, Mail Order Department, 250 West 55th Street, New York, New York 10019 for $1.20 including postage).

- Student Advisory Committee Handbook, Department of Health Education and Welfare, Publication no. (OE) 75-08001, 1974 (available at a cost of 45 cents from the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402).

Disciplinary and Grievance Procedures:

- Orderly Schools That Serve All Children, Susan C. Kaeser, A report of the Citizens' Council for Ohio Schools, July 1979 (available at a cost of $3.00 per copy from the Citizens' Council for Ohio Schools, 517 The Arcade, Cleveland, Ohio 44114).

- 'Is That Really Fair?' Comments and Responses on the Needs, Purpose, Status, and Functions of Student Grievance Procedures in Public Education, 1978 (available from the National Education of Education, 1200 19th Street, NW, Washington, D.C. 20208).

Prevention of Disruptions and School Security:

- School Disruptions: Tips for Educators and Police, Community Relations Service and Law Enforcement Assistance Administration of the U.S. Department of Justice (available from the Community Relations Service, U.S. Department of Justice, 550 11th Street, NW, Washington, D.C. 20530).

Monitoring and Assessment of Integration and Desegregation Plans:

- Viewpoints and Guidelines on Court Appointed Monitoring Commissions in School Desegregation, Lila Carol, report of a symposium sponsored by the Community Relations Service of the U.S. Department of Justice and the College of Education, Ohio State University, 1977 (single free copies of this report may be obtained from the Community Relations Service, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, D.C. 20530).

- A Checklist for Assessing School Desegregation Plans, Leonard B. Stevens and Frances Hunter, the Greater Cleveland Project, February 1976 (available from the Greater Cleveland Project, 2330 Euclid Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio 44115).

- Checklist: Rate Your School for Racism and Sexism, Racism and Sexism Resource Center for Educators, 1977 (available from the Racism/Sexism Resource Center for Educators, 1841 Broadway, Room 300, New York, New York 10023).

The Role of Private and Parochial Schools in School Desegregation:

- Catholic Schools and Racial Integration: Perspectives, Directors, Models, National Catholic Conference for Interracial Justice, 1029 Vermont Avenue, Suite 580, Washington, D.C. 20005.

- The Catholic Community and the Integration of Public and Catholic Schools, Mary Von Euler and Gail Lambers, editors, National Institute of Education, 1979 (available from the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402).

Parental Involvement in School Operations and Educational Decision-Making:

- Working With Your School, Texas Advisory Committee to the United States Commission on Civil Rights, February 1977 (available from ERIC Document Reproduction Service, P.O. Box, 190 Arlington, Virginia 22210 at a price of $6.67, specify order no. ED 148-539).

- Educating Parents About Education: A Review of Some Issues, Methods, and Source Information, Ethel Lichtman, Leadership Training Institute, December 1974 (copies are available at cost from Ethel Lichtman, 278 Monroe Drive, #2, Mountain View, California 94040).

- Parents Organizing to Improve Schools, (available in Spanish), National Committee for Citizens in Education, (available from the National Committee for Citizens in Education, Suite 410, Wilde Lake Village Green, Columbia, Maryland 21044 at a price of $1.50 per copy).

- Participative Management and Decentralized Decision Making -- Working Models, Association of California School Administrators (available from the Association of California School Administrators, 1575 Old Bayshore Highway, Burlingame, California 94010).

- Citizen Participation in Education: an Annotated Bibliography, Don Davies, Institute for Responsive Education, 1974 (available from the Institute for Responsive Education, 704 Commonwealth Avenue, Boston, Massachusetts 02215 at a price of $3.00).

- "The New Faces of Community Participation in the Seventies", Mario Fantini, Urban/Rural Newsletter, May 1974 (available from the Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching, Stanford University, Palo Alto, CA 94305).

- The Third Side of the Desk: How Parents Can Change the Schools, Hannah Hess, 1973 (available from Scribners & Sons, 597 Fifth Avenue, New York, New York 10017).

- How to Change the Schools: A Parents Action Handbook on How to Fight the System, Ellen Lurie, 1970 (available from Random House and Vintage Press, P.O. Box 398, New York, New York 10009).

- Making Schools Work: An Educational Handbook for Students, Parents and Professionals, Massachusetts Advocacy Center, Massachusetts Law Reform Institute, 2 Park Square, Boston, Massachusetts 02116, (617) 482-0890.

- Putting it Together with Parents: A Guide to Parent Involvement in Educational Programs, California State Department of Education, 1973 (available from the California State Department of Education, Sacramento, California 95814).

Periodicals:

In addition to the reports, pamphlets, books and articles that have been listed, there are a number of regularly published periodicals that can serve to keep readers up-to-date on developments in the area of school desegregation and aware of new resources. Among the most helpful are:

- Progress, a newsletter which focuses primarily on state policy issues in school desegregation and also covers federal desegregation activities and desegregation research. To be placed on the Progress mailing list write to the National Desegregation Strategies Task Force, 1860 Lincoln Street, Suite 300, Denver, Colorado 80295.

- Integrateducation, a regularly published journal which contains articles and reports on a wide variety of issues related to school desegregation. It is available at an annual subscription rate of $12.00 for individuals and $15.00 for institutions from Integrated Education Associates, School of Education, Northwestern University, 2003 Sheridan Road, Evanston, Illinois 60201.

- Network, subtitled "The Paper for Parents". This publication of the National Committee for Citizens in Education is intended to provide balanced coverage of current developments and continuing issues related to school operations. The focus of the paper is presenting facts about schools from a perspective that is useful to parents. Network is published eight times during the school year and the subscription rate is $8.00 annually. Subscriptions should be directed to the National Committee for Citizens in Education, 410 Wilde Lake Village Green, Columbia, Maryland 21044.

- Equal Opportunity Review, a publication of the ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education, contains a bibliography and articles on issues in urban and minority education. The Review is published periodically and is available from the Institute for Urban and Minority Education, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, New York 10027.

APPENDICES

Appendix A

PARTICIPANTS IN WORKSHOPS LEADING TO PRODUCTION OF THE HANDBOOK AND RECIPIENTS OF HANDBOOK DRAFTS FOR PRE-PUBLICATION REVIEW

Over the course of the three-year project leading to production of this handbook, staff at the Center for Metropolitan Studies made a concerted effort to solicit input from a wide variety of persons in the local community. Regular contact was maintained with most of the major actors in the desegregation process and many other groups in the community.

During the final year of the project, when conceptualization and drafting of the handbook were in the final stages, a formal mechanism was set up for seeking input and review from groups in the two school districts in which Center staff had worked. In the Winter of 1979, a series of workshops was held to develop suggestions for the type of information that should be included in the handbook and the format for presentation that would be most useful. Workshop participants included parents, students, administrators, school board members, business and civic leaders, law enforcement officials, and technical assistants from the St. Louis and Ferguson-Florissant Reorganized school districts. In June of 1979, after the first draft of the handbook based on the workshop suggestions and research of Center staff had been completed, the draft was mailed to all persons who had been invited to the workshops for their review and comments. Listed below are persons who were invited to the workshops and/or reviewed copies of the original draft of this manual.

Several persons were particularly helpful in reviewing materials related to production of the handbook and providing suggestions for improvement. Included in that group are Anita Ford, Co-chairperson of the

Citizens Education Task Force; Robert Wentz, Superintendent of the St. Louis Public Schools; Edward Foote, Dean of the Washington University Law School; James DeClue, Chairman of the Education Committee of the St. Louis NAACP; Fred Danken, Christ Seminary, Seminex; David Colton, Director of the Center for Law in Education, Washington University; and Milton Lewis, Community Relations Service, U.S. Department of Justice.

Center staff would like to express their gratitude to all of these persons who provided assistance in development of the handbook.

SCHOOL SYSTEM PERSONNEL -- BOARD MEMBERS, ADMINISTRATORS, TEACHERS, STAFF

Penelope Alcott, Board Member
St. Louis Public Schools

Evelyn Battle, Teacher
St. Louis Public Schools &
President, St. Louis Teachers Union

Dorothy Bell, Teacher
St. Louis Public Schools

Gordon Benson, Board Member
St. Louis Public Schools

Dorothy Brooks, Social Worker
St. Louis Public Schools

Sarah Clardy, Teacher
St. Louis Public Schools

Mattie Devine, PAC Coordinator
Title I, St. Louis Public Schools

Jack Dwyer, Director
Public Affairs, St. Louis Public Schools

Robert Flenory, Security Officer
St. Louis Public Schools

Robert Fritz, Asst. to the Superintendent
Ferguson-Florissant Public Schools

Jean Garfolo, Teacher
Ferguson-Florissant Public Schools

William Hampton, Principal
Ferguson-Florissant Public Schools

Robert Hughes, Director of Security
St. Louis Public Schools

Betty Klinefelter, Board Member
St. Louis Public Schools

Harold Lesak, Principal
Ferguson-Florissant Public Schools

Samuel Miller, Director
Magnet School Program
St. Louis Public Schools

Lawrence Nicholson, Board Member
St. Louis Public Schools

James Poor, Board Member
Ferguson-Florissant Public Schools

Louis Ratz, Assoc. Superintendent
St. Louis Public Schools

Daniel Schlafly, Board Member
St. Louis Public Schools

Linda Smith, Teacher
St. Louis Public Schools &
President, St. Louis Teachers Association

Marjorie Smith, Board Member
St. Louis Public Schools

Dorothy Springer, Board Member
St. Louis Public Schools

Martin Temple, Vice Principal
Ferguson-Florissant Public Schools

Marjorie Weir, Board Member
St. Louis Public Schools

Joseph Wells, Board Member
Feruson-Florissant Public Schools

Robert Wentz, Superintendent
St. Louis Public Schools

Ed Wilhelm, Board Member
Ferguson-Florissant Public Schools

Mayetta Williams, Teacher
Ferguson-Florissant Public Schools

PARENTS AND STUDENTS

Jerianne Adams, Parent
St. Louis Public Schools

Walker Bond, Parent
Ferguson-Florissant Public Schools

Linda Brooks, Parent
St. Louis Public Schools

Margene Buckingham, Parent
Ferguson-Florissant Public Schools

Frances Crawford, Parent
St. Louis Public Schools

Beverly De Louch, Student
St. Louis Public Schools

Bernice Elrod, Parent
St. Louis Public Schools

Barbara Esenberg, Parent
St. Louis Public Schools

Carole Franklin, Parent
St. Louis Public Schools

Rosetta Fugua, Parent
St. Louis Public Schools

Richard Goehring, Student
St. Louis Public Schools'

Barbara Goldsby, Parent
St. Louis Public Schools

Kathy Hamilton, Student
St. Louis Public Schools

William Hampton, Parent
St. Louis Public Schools

Birdia Jackson, Title I, PAC
St. Louis Public Schools

Nathaniel Johnson
ESAA Advisory Committee
St. Louis Public Schools

Ulysses Jones, Parent
St. Louis Public Schools

Minnie Liddell, Parent
St. Louis Public Schools

Tom McLaren, Parent
St. Louis Public Schools

John McHaynes, Parent
St. Louis Public Schools

Bernice Netterville, Parent
St. Louis Public Schools

Doc Netterville, Parent
St. Louis Public Schools

Madeline Oliver
ESAA Advisory Committee
St. Louis Public Schools

Marsue Pelligrino, Parent
St. Louis Public Schools

Michelle Pellegrino, Student
St. Louis Public Schools

Roger Perry
Consultant to the Superintendent
St. Louis Public Schools

William Proulk, Student
St. Louis Public Schools

Alyosius Royal
Ferguson-Florissant Public Schools

Jan Sanders, Student
St. Louis Public Schools

Sharon Smith, Student
St. Louis Public Schools

James Stark, Parent
Ferguson-Florissant Public Schools

Donna Strong, Parent
St. Louis Public Schools

Josie Thomas
ESAA Advisory Committee
St. Louis Public Schools

PARENTS AND STUDENTS (cont.)

Joan Thomlinson
ESAA Advisory Committee
St. Louis Public Schools

Elaine Torrez, Parent
St. Louis Public Schools

Oscar Washington
ESAA Advisory Committee
St. Louis Public Schools

Helen Williamson, Parent
St. Louis Public Schools

Beatrice Yarber, Parent
St. Louis Public Schools

BUSINESS, POLITICAL, CIVIC, LABOR, AND RELIGIOUS LEADERS

Jim Anderson
Amalgamated Clothing Workers

Freeman Bosley
St. Louis Board of Alderman

Leonard Burst
St. Louis Board of Alderman

Rosemary Covington, Director
Urban Programs, Ralston Purina

Robert Crane, Director
Corporate Relations, Emerson Electric

Frederick Danken
Christ Seminary-Seminex

John Ervin, Vice President
Danforth Foundation

William Gillespie, Pastor
Cote Brillante Presbyterian Church

O'Ray Graber
National Conference of Christians
& Jews

W.L. Hadley Griffin, Chairman
Brown Group

Suzanne Hart
St. Louis Police Board

Richard Hoffman, Pastor
St. Phillip's Lutheran Church

Leonard Robinson, Political Coordinator
United Auto Workers

John Shocklee, Executive Director
St. Louis Archdiocesan Commission
on Human Rights

Paul Simon, President
St. Louis Board of Alderman

Wayman Smith
St. Louis Board of Alderman

William Symes, President
Monsanto Fund

Nicholas Veeder, Co-Chairperson
Citizens Education Task Force

Inez Wilburn
Council of Labor Union Women

REPRESENTATIVES OF ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES

Charles Kirkwood, Juvenile Officer
St. Louis Police Department

John Rencher, Director
Unit for Desegregation
Missouri Department of Elementary
& Secondary Education

John Skelton, Juvenile Officer
St. Louis Police Department

Robert Treuktin, Chief of Police
Florissant Police Department

REPRESENTATIVES OF OTHER INTEREST GROUPS

Frank Avesing
Center for Urban Programs
St. Louis University

Carrie Bash
Urban League of St. Louis

Fred Caesar, News Director
KSD Radio

Al Chapelle, Training Consultant

David Colton, Director
Center for Law in Education
Washington University

Cathleen Crowley
Commission on Human Rights
St. Louis Archdiocese

James De Clue, Chairman
Education Committee
St. Louis NAACP

James Ellis
St. Louis Post-Dispatch

Anita Ford, Co-chairperson
Citizens Education Task Force

Virvus Jones, Assistant Director
Citizens Education Task Force

Milton Lewis
Community Relations Service

Josephine Lockhart,
Project Consultant

Robert Mai, Manager
Educational Telecommunications
KETC-TV

Suzanne Moore, Educational Coordinator
Urban League of St. Louis

Everette Nance, Director
Midwest Community Education
Development Center — UMSL

Thomas Nolan
Commission on Human Rights
St. Louis Archdiocese

Steve Nuddleston
KMOX-TV

Gary Orfield
Institute of Government and Public Affa
University of Illinois

John Perez, Regional Director
Community Relations Service

Frances Thomas, Project Consultant

Rachel Tompkins, Director
Citizens Council for Ohio Schools

Michael Williams, Editor
St. Louis Sentinel Newspaper

James Wright, News Director
KPLR-TV

John Wright, Director
Citizens Education Task Force

St. Louis Congregations and School Desegregation: A Time for Study and Action

January 1978

Appendix B

The following document was prepared at the request of a city-wide coalition of citizens groups under the auspices of the Danforth Foundation, and the National Conference of Christians and Jews, and distributed to all clergy in the St. Louis metropolitan area. It is an example of the types of materials that can be adapted for a specific local community and set of audiences during the various stages of the desegregation process.

Center for Metropolitan Studies

UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI-ST. LOUIS

8001 Natural Bridge Road
St. Louis, Missouri 63121
Telephone: (314) 453-5273

St. Louis Congregations and School Desegregation: A Time for Study and Action

January 1978

Wherever school desegregation and other important social changes have taken place successfully and with good feeling on the part of all concerned, the key has been aware, mobilized, and active community leadership. In St. Louis, an essential part of that leadership is found in the clergy and congregants of the City's more than 850 churches and synagogues.

Some time within the current calendar year, District Judge James H. Meredith will rule on the St. Louis public school desegregation case before his court. He may or may not find the school system at fault for the current racial patterns in the schools. What he will find and order is uncertain. But he will act, and the community needs to prepare itself to move forward on behalf of the nearly 80,000 public school children in the City of St. Louis.

The 850 churches and synagogues in St. Louis could make a vital difference.

The following principles and suggestions have been found useful by churches and synagogues in other cities where action has taken place in support of peaceful, productive school desegregation.

1. "The single most important ingredient in achieving peaceful and successful desegregation is affirmative leadership by those entrusted with /the/ community's social, economic, educational political and religious institutions." -- John Buggs, Staff Director, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights.

2. In a democratic society, law is the basis for protecting and guaranteeing constitutional rights. Any citizen effort regarding school desegregation must treat the law with fragile respect -- whether working within the law to implement a court decision, or acting nonviolently through to the final appeal if the decision is believed to be unjust.

The University of Missouri is an equal employment and educational opportunity institution.

3. A strong public education system in St. Louis is essential to the health and progress of the City and the area.

4. Religious and other community leaders need to prepare for action in behalf of peaceful school desegregation far in advance of any court ruling. In St. Louis, the time to begin preparation has already passed.

5. Preparation by religious leaders now should include:

a. Formation or strengthening of ties among the highest religious officials in the community (bishops, heads of religious agencies and councils, etc.), with frequent meetings for informational purposes, and the issuing of strong statements to all congregants in support of high quality public education and peaceful, citizen-based approaches to school change.

b. Each congregation should provide study opportunities for all its members -- students, parents, grandparents, friends -- to learn the facts about the St. Louis public schools, about proposed desegregation plans, and about ways to assist in peaceful desegregation.

c. Each minister, pastor, priest, and rabbi entrusted with the leadership and care of a congregation has an obligation to become well-informed about the school system, proposed desegregation plans, and ways he or she may assist.

d. Churches and synagogues should adopt or pair with a near-by public school for purposes of sharing information and resources, and jointly working for peaceful desegregation.

e. The social concerns committee (or similar body) in each congregation should designate "Peaceful School Desegregation" as its major study and action theme for the year.

f. Churches and synagogues should sponsor town meetings, educational conferences, or community forums to inform congregants and others about the desegregation process and ways they can help -- in their own attendance areas and on a collaborative city-wide basis.

g. Churches and synagogues should initiate meetings with the school board, central administration and officials of individual schools to express their concern and determine ways to help.

h. Churches and synagogues should establish or participate in rumor control centers. On any school desegregation issue, get the facts...do not spread rumors.

i. Days of prayer or prayer vigils before and during desegregation have led, in some cities, to thoughtful discussions and action. St. Louis congregations may wish to do the same.

j. St. Louis churches and synagogues should invite their national denominational specialists in race relations and desegregation to come to St. Louis to assist in training and development of local religious support activities.

k. Parish pairing for dialogue and action on school desegregation should take place between predominantly white and predominantly black congregations within the city, both within and across denominational lines.

l. Officials of those denominations operating parochial schools should state clearly and frequently that their schools will not enroll students whose parents are transferring them from public schools to avoid desegregation.

m. Congregational and St. Louis area religious bulletins and newsletters should carry regular articles on school issues, including desegregation and ways citizens may help.

* * *

There is no single action plan or "best way". Each denomination and eacn congregation must develop its own plan for action after careful study and discussion.

But there are three certainties:

1. The degree to which school desegregation is peaceful and satisfactory to the people of St. Louis depends largely on informed, effective citizen leadership.

2. The 850 churches and synagogues make up the single best city-wide network of organized groups of people committed to helping and caring. Their activity -- or inactivity -- in the critical months ahead will make an important difference in St. Louis school desegregation. By whatever theological or ethical standard, the churches and synagogues have a moral obligation to act -- now.

3. There are many sources of help, locally as well as nationally, for religious groups who want to get involved. Any national resource can be reached best through the denomination's national social action or missions office, or through local sources of help. Among the local resources who can help churches and synagogues are:

a. The denominational offices (bishop, conference minister, synodical office, presyter, district superintendent, etc.).

b. Citizens Education Task Force, John Wright, Executive Director (773-1444).

c. St. Louis Conference on Education, Carolyn Losos, Director (644-5035).

d. National Conference of Christians and Jews, O'Ray Graber, Executive Director (241-5103).

e. The Danforth Foundation, John Ervin, Vice-President (862-6200).

f. Community Conflict Resolution Program, Center for Metropolitan Studies, University of Missouri-St. Louis, James Laue, Director (453-5273).

g. St. Louis Public Schools. Call the principal(s) of the school(s) in the area, or the director of the nearest Community School program.

Prepared by:

James Laue, Director
Center for Metropolitan Studies
University of Missouri-St. Louis